RASHIDA MALIK

# IQBAL

## The Spiritual Father of Pakistan



# IQBAL

*The Spiritual Father of Pakistan*

*By*

**Rashida Malik**

SANG-E-MEEL PUBLICATIONS
25, SHAHRAH-E-PAKISTAN (LOWER MALL) LAHORE.

954.91 Rashida Malik
Iqbal : The Spiritual Father of Pakistan / Rashida Malik.-Lahore: Sang-e-Meel Publications, 2003.
153p.
Bibliography : p. 147 - 149
1. Tehreek-o-Tarikh-e-Pakistan.
I. Title.

2003
Published by:
Niaz Ahmad
Sang-e-Meel Publications,
Lahore.



*ISBN 969-35-1371-1*

**SANG-E-MEEL PUBLICATIONS**
Chowk Urdu Bazar Lahore. Pakistan. Phone 7667970
Phones: 7220100 - 7228143 Fax: 7245101
http://www.sang-e-meel.com e-mail: smp@sang-e-meel.com
25 Shahrah-e-Pakistan (Lower Mall), P.O. Box 997 Lahore-54000 PAKISTAN
PRINTED AT: ZAHID BASHIR PRINTER, LAHORE.

# CONTENTS



# APPENDICES

For
My Parents

For
My Parents

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book grew out of my M.Phil. thesis. At the National Institute of Pakistan Studies; I have benefited from exchange of views with a number of fellow students. I am grateful to them for providing me an opportunity to share and refine my ideas. Thanks are also due to Latif, Aslam, Ilyas and Mir Afzal of NIPS for their cooperation.

It is with a deep sense of gratitude that I acknowledge and thank Professor Fateh Muhammad Malik, who guided me all along with the affectionate care of a spiritual father. Muhammad Suheyl Umar, Director Iqbal Academy Pakistan (Lahore) also offered encouragement to which I am greatly indebted.

I do not know how to thank my mother who is a constant and abiding source of my spiritual strength as well as material well-being. My husband, Major Shehzad-ul-Hasan Amir continues to be a great source of strength and inspiration to me. I do not know how to express my sense of graditude to him.

(Mrs.) Rashda Malik

Multan

August 2002

# 1

## INTRODUCTION

Allama Muhammad Iqbal, the poet-philosopher of Pakistan is universally acknowledged as the spiritual father of Pakistan. The concept of Pakistan is usually attributed to his Allahabad Address of 1930, in which he had articulated and unfolded the concept of a separate Muslim nationalism as opposed to the concept of a composite Indian nationalism. But during the last few years a new controversy has sprung up in our intellectual circles regarding the origins of the concept of Pakistan. K.K. Aziz, a well-known historian, has challenged this view in his book *A History of the Idea of Pakistan*. Aziz writes that:

> "There is no doubt that Iqbal is a public hero of exceptional standing, and receives adoration which is denied to other historical figures. There is always an element of dogmatism and irrationality in hero-worship. The great man is made out to be the greatest. Minor incidents of his life are exaggerated into legends. A myth is created and put into the national pantheon."[1]

K.K.Aziz has attempted to shatter this "myth" and declared that Iqbal has nothing to do with the concept of Pakistan. His conclusions were accepted by Saad R. Khairi, who writes in his book entitled *Jinnah Reinterpreted* that:

> "The myth started two years after Iqbal's death, when the Pakistan resolution was passed in 1940…… After Pakistan was established, the myth was given official approval by the Information Department of the Government. The man in charge of this Department was an ICS officer, who thought that it would give an aura of romance to the Pakistan Movement if it was projected as having had its origin in the dream of a poet. The dream of a poet realized by a statesman."[2]

This controversy is gaining a momentum. During the span of one year i.e. 1997, two Urdu books have been published to challenge Iqbal as the originator of the idea of Pakistan. Ch. Mohd. Ashraf's book مصورِ پاکستان کون؟ (who gave the idea of Pakistan? Some bitter truths) and Nisar Ahmed Kasana's book مطالبۂ پاکستان اور چوہدری رحمت علی (who is the real creator of Pakistan?) attribute the origin of the concept of Pakistan to Ch. Rahmat Ali, who came to lime-light as a young devotee of Iqbal in 1933. Earlier in 1995 appeared a book entitled چوہدری رحمت علی اور تحریکِ پاکستان (Chaudhry Rahmat Ali and the Pakistan Movement) by Abdul Hamid.

The authors of all the three Urdu publications have attempted to project Chaudhry Rahmat Ali as the real originator of the idea of Pakistan. Following the footprints of K.K. Aziz, they claim that the concept of Pakistan has wrongly been attributed to Allama Iqbal. None of them has a claim on originality or scholarship. They are neither historians, nor political scientists, nor even writers of any standing. All the three books are the first and the lone publications of these writers. There is another striking similarity in these books *i.e.* all the three writers started their professional careers as clerks in government or semi-government organisations and rose to prominent positions through hard work and perseverance in legal profession or administrative set-up of non-academic autonomous bodies.

The nature and scope of all the three books is journalistic. They draw heavily on the writings of K.K. Aziz. The following statement made by Abdul Hamid in the preface of his book is true in respect of all the three books:

> ”ڈاکٹر۔ کے۔کے عزیز واحد مورخ ہیں، جنہوں نے چوہدری صاحب کی خدمات کو درست طور پر اجاگر کیا ہے۔نوجوان نسل اس اقدام پر ان کی ممنون ہے۔ میں نے ان کی تحریر سے متاثر ہو کر چوہدری رحمت علی کے بارے میں کچھ لکھنے کی جسارت کی ہےاور زیادہ تر ان کی کتاب Rehmat Ali: A Biography سے ہی استفادہ کیا ہے“۔[3]

(Dr. K.K. Aziz is the only historian who has projected the services of Chaudhry Rahmat Ali in the correct perspective. The younger

generation is indebted to him. He inspired me to write something about Chaudhry Rahmat Ali. I have derived most of the material from his book: *Rahmat Ali: A biography*).

Like K.K. Aziz, all the above-mentioned books take into consideration only one writing of Iqbal *i.e.*, his Allahabad Address of 1930.

I have sought to clear the confusion by tracing the origin and development of the concept of Pakistan in Iqbal's poetic as well as prose writings and philosophic discourses from the year 1907 to 1938, the year in which he breathed his last, in chapter two.

Chapter three deals with the universally acclaimed image of Iqbal as the spiritual father of Pakistan. In this chapter I have drawn on the writings of some of the most eminent Pakistani, European, American and Russian historians, political scientists and orientalists.

In chapter four I have tried to explore the fallacy relating to the concept of Pakistan, created by K.K. Aziz in his books entitled *Rahmat Ali: A Biography* and *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali*. By a critical study and an analytical approach I have presented a comparative study of the writings of Iqbal and Rahmat Ali. Thus I have been able to prove that the assertions of K.K. Aziz are based on misreading of Iqbal's writings on the concept of a separate Muslim nationhood in India.

Chapter five presents Rahmat Ali's concept of Pakistan as reflected in his writings from 1940 onwards.

Chapter six contains the conclusion of my study. It highlights the conflicting nature of the two concepts of Pakistan and maintains that the movement for Pakistan was inspired by Iqbal's concept of a separate Muslim nationalism in India. Thus, Allama Iqbal is rightly acknowledged as the spiritual father of Pakistan.

## Notes and References


1. Aziz, K.K.: *A History of the Idea of Pakistan,* Lahore, 1987, p. 185.
2. Khairi, Saad R.: *Jinnah Reinterpreted,* Karachi, 1995, p. 335.
3. Abdul Hamid: *Chaudhry Rahmat Ali Aur Tehrik-i-Pakistan* (Urdu) Lahore, 1995, p. 18.

# 2

## EVOLUTION OF IQBAL'S CONCEPT OF PAKISTAN

Allama Muhammad Iqbal unfolded his concept of a separate Muslim nationalism in India in his presidential address delivered at the annual session of the All-India Muslim League at Allahabad on the 29th December, 1930. This concept was evolved and crystalysed during a long period of time spread over quarter of a century. Iqbal himself has confessed in his interview with the *Bombay Chronicle* (17 September - 31 December 1931) that:

"There is no doubt that my ideas about nationalism have undergone a definite change. In my college days I was a zealous Nationalist that I am not now. The change is due to a mature thinking. It is unfortunate that my later writings are all in Persian which is little understood in this country." [1]

Iqbal's Urdu poetry before 1906 and specially poems such as نیا شوالہ (The New Temple) and ترانۂ ہندی (The Indian Anthem) bear ample testimony to the fact that during his student days Iqbal was an adherent of the concept of a composite Indian Nationalism. The gradual transformation

of Iqbal's political beliefs started during his stay in Europe as a student of philosophy. It was particularly due to Iqbal's insight into the nature of the conflict and strife between the European nation states, which he could forsee, was leading Europe to world-wars, and partially due to the developments within India, such as the Hindu Communist's agitation against the partition of Bengal in 1906, which had come about on purely administrative basis but had accidentally yielded some benefits to the Muslims of East Bengal. The Urdu poem عبدالقادر کے نام (To Abdul Qadir) signifies his renunciation of the concept of a composite Indian nationalism and his adoption of a new concept of *Millat i.e* Muslim unity:

اٹھ کہ ظلمت ہوئی پیدا افق خاور پر
بزم میں شعلہ نوائی سے اُجالا کر دیں
دیکھ! یثرب میں ہوا ناقۂ لیلیٰ بیکار
قیس کو آرزوئے نو سے شناسا کر دیں

(Arise! see that a new darkness has engulfed the Eastern horizon,

Let us spread light with the flames of our voice.

Look! in the holy land, the lover's way of life has been renounced.

Let us inspire other Qais (the lover) with new dreams.)

A *ghazal* written in the same year (1907) gives utterance to similar sentiments:

زمانہ آیا ہے بے حجابی کا، عام دیدار یار ہوگا
سکوت تھا پردہ دار جس کا وہ راز اب آشکار ہوگا
کبھی جو آوارۂ جنوں تھے، وہ بستیوں میں پھر آ بسیں گے
برہنہ پائی وہی رہے گی، مگر نیا خار زار ہوگا
سنا دیا گوشِ منتظر کو حجاز کی خامشی نے آخر
جو عہد صحرائیوں سے باندھا گیا تھا پھر استوار ہوگا
نکل کے صحرا سے جس نے روما کی سلطنت کو الٹ دیا تھا
سنا ہے یہ قدسیوں سے میں نے وہ شیر پھر ہوشیار ہوگا
سفینۂ برگ گل بنا لے گا قافلہ مورِ ناتواں کا
ہزار موجوں کی ہو کشاکش، مگر یہ دریا کے پار ہوگا
میں ظلمتِ شب میں لے کے نکلوں گا اپنے درماندہ کارواں کو
شرر فشاں ہو گی آہ میری، نفس مرا شعلہ بار ہوگا

(The time of unveiling has come, The Beloved will be seen by all,

that secret which was veiled by silence shall become manifest.

That cycle has gone of cup-bearer when they drank in hiding.

The whole world shall become a tavern, and all shall drink.

Those who wandered insane shall return to dwell in cities,

their feet shall be naked as before, but those meadows shall be new.

The lion which came out of the wilderness and upset the Empire of Rome,

I hear from angels that he shall awaken once again.

Even the frail petal of a rose will be made into a boat,

but it will safely cross the angry seas.

I shall lead my weary caravan in the darkness of the night,

my sighs shall emit sparks and my breath shall create flames.)

One of the main motivating passions in his poetry from 1908 onward is to establish and strengthen a separate and distinct Muslim identity. Now he ventures upon to compose ترانۂ ملّی (the Anthem of the Islamic Community), which is as follows:

چین و عرب ہمارا، ہندوستاں ہمارا
مسلم ہیں ہم، وطن ہے سارا جہاں ہمارا

توحید کی امانت سینوں میں ہے ہمارے
آساں نہیں مٹانا نام و نشاں ہمارا

دنیا کے بتکدوں میں پہلا وہ گھر خدا کا
ہم اس کے پاسباں ہیں، وہ پاسباں ہمارا

تیغوں کے سائے میں ہم پل کر جواں ہوئے ہیں
خنجر ہلال کا ہے قومی نشاں ہمارا

مغرب کی وادیوں میں گونجی اذاں ہماری
تھمتا نہ تھا کسی سے سیلِ رواں ہمارا

باطل سے دبنے والے اے آسماں نہیں ہم
سو بار کر چکا ہے تو امتحاں ہمارا

اے گلستانِ اندلس! وہ دن ہیں یاد تجکو
تھا تیری ڈالیوں مین جب آشیاں ہمارا

اے موجِ دجلہ! تو بھی پہچانتی ہے ہم کو
اب تک ہے تیرا دریا افسانہ خواں ہمارا

اے ارضِ پاک! تیری حرمت پہ کٹ مرے ہم
ہے خون تری رگوں میں اب تک رواں ہمارا

سالارِ کارواں ہے میرِ حجازؐ اپنا
اس نام سے ہے باقی آرامِ جاں ہمارا

اقبالؔ کا ترانہ بانگِ درا ہے گویا
ہوتا ہے جادہ پیما پھر کارواں ہمارا

(China and Arabia are ours, India is ours.

We are Muslims, the whole world is ours.

God's unity is held in trust in our breasts.

It is not easy to erase our name and sign.

Among the idol temples of the world the first is the house of God.

We are its keepers, it is our keeper.

Brought up in the shadow of the swords, we have reached maturity;

the sciemitar of the cresent moon is the emblem of our community.

In the valleys of the West our call to prayer resounded

our onward flow was never stemmed by anyone.

We, O heaven, are not to be supressed by falsehood!

A hundred times you have tested us.

Oh garden of Andalusia! Do you remember those days,

when our nest was in your branches?

O waves of Tigris! You also recognize us,

Your river still relates our story.

O land of purity! We fell and died for your honour,

Our blood still courses through your veins.

The Lord of Hijaz is the leader of our community,

From this name comes the peace of our soul.

Iqbal's songs are like the bell of the caravan.

Once more our caravan measures the road.)

(Translation : D.J. Matthews)

In the next poem entitled وطنیت (Territorial Nationalism) Iqbal rejects the prevalent concept of territorial nationalism. He considers this concept as a modern form of idolatry and hence incompatible with Islam:

اس دور میں مے اور ہے جام اور ہے جم اور
ساقی نے بنا کی روشِ لطف و کرم اور
مسلم نے بھی تعمیر کیا اپنا حرم اور
تہذیب کے آذر نے ترشوائے صنم اور

ان تازہ خداؤں میں بڑا سب سے وطن ہے
جو پیرہن اس کا ہے وہ مذہب کا کفن ہے

یہ بت کہ تراشیدہء تہذیبِ نوی ہے
غارت گرِ کاشانہء دینِ نبویؐ ہے
بازو ترا توحید کی قوت سے قوی ہے
اسلام ترا دیس ہے تو مصطفوی ہے

نظارۂ دیرینہ زمانے کو دکھا دے
اے مصطفوی خاک میں اس بت کو ملا دے

ہو قیدِ مقامی تو نتیجہ ہے تباہی
رہ بحر میں آزادِ وطن صورتِ ماہی
ہے ترکِ وطن سنتِ محبوبِ الٰہی
دے تو بھی نبوت کی صداقت پہ گواہی

گفتارِ سیاست میں وطن اور ہی کچھ ہے
ارشادِ نبوت میں وطن اور ہی کچھ ہے

اقوامِ جہاں میں ہے رقابت تو اسی سے
تسخیر ہے مقصودِ تجارت تو اسی سے
خالی ہے صداقت سے سیاست تو اسی سے
کمزور کا گھر ہوتا ہے غارت تو اسی سے

اقوام میں مخلوقِ خدا بٹتی ہے اس سے
قومیت اسلام کی جڑ کٹتی ہے اس سے

(This era has a different cup, different wine and another Jamshed.

The *Sāqi* has adopted new ways to charm the drinkers.

Western civilisation has fashioned new idols and the Muslim has created

a new *Harem* (sanctuary) where these new idols are being worshiped.

Country is the supreme among all the contemporary idols.

Its cloak is the shroud of Religion.

This idol of country as fashioned by the contemporary civilisation,

destroys the home of the prophet (Islam).

Your arm obtains strength from the power of *Tauheed* (monotheism).

Islam is your home, and you are the follower of the Prophet.

Show to the world a glimpse of the old days? O followers of Mustafa (the chosen one i.e the Prophet of Islam)!

Crush this idol in the dust.

If one were bound with a place, the result will be utter destruction.

You should live like a fish in the ocean independent of country.

In the parlance of politics "country" means some thing different.

And according to the saying of the Prophet country is something else.

The nations of the world are at odds with each other
because of the concept of territorial nationalism.
The aim of commerce has become the conquest of
other nations because of territorial nationalism.
Because of this concept politics has divorced itself
from truth and the destruction of the house of the poor is
justified by the idea of territorial superiority.
God's creation is divided into nations by territorial nationalism.
The roots of Islamic nationality is destroyed by it.)

This forceful and moving poem presents Iqbal's main arguments against the modern Western concept of territorial, racial or linguistic nationalism as well as arguments in favour of a separate Muslim nationalism which springs from the spiritual homogeneity and a common world-view. In his *Stray Reflections* which he penned down in the year 1910, Iqbal has observed:

> "Islam appeared as a protest against idolatry. And what is patriotism but a subtle form of idolatry. A deification of a material object. Islam could not tolerate idolatry in any form. It is our eternal mission to protest against idolatry in all its forms. What was to be demolished by Islam could not be made the very principle of its structure as a political community. The fact that the Prophet prospered and died in a place not his birthplace is perhaps a mystic hint to the same effect".[2]

Exploring the nature of Muslim solidarity he wrote in the same note-book, in the same year:

> "Our solidarity as a community rests on the religious principle. The moment this hold is loosened we are nowhere. Probably the fate of the Jews will befall on us. But our educationists are still groping in the dark: they are perhaps too much dazzled to realise the difference between Islamism which constructs nationality out of a purely abstract idea, *i.e* religion and "Westernism", the very life blood of whose concept of nationality is a concrete thing, *i.e.* country."[3]

This difference between Islamism and Westernism on the question of nationality is further elaborated by Iqbal in his detailed analytical essay entitled: "Political thought in Islam", which appeared in *Hindustan Review* (Vols. XXXII and XXXIII, 1910-1911). Iqbal asserted:

> "The Law of Islam does not recognise the apparently natural differences of race, nor the historical differences of nationality. The political ideal of Islam consists in the creation of a people born of a free fusion of all races and nationalities. Nationality, with Islam, is not the highest limit of political development. For the general principles of the law of Islam rests on human nature, not on the peculiarities of a particular people. The inner cohesion of such a nation would consist not in ethnic or geographic unity, nor in the unity of language or social

tradition, but in the unity of the religious and political ideal. Or, in the psychological fact of "like-mindedness". The membership of this nation, consequently, would not be determined by birth, marriage, domicile or naturalisation. It would be determined by a public declaration of "like-mindedness", and would terminate when the individual has ceased to be like-minded with others. The ideal territory for such a nation would be the whole earth. The Arabs, like the Greeks and the Romans endeavoured to create such a nation or the world-state by conquest, but failed to actualise their ideal, the realisation of this ideal, however, is not impossible. For the ideal nation does exist in germ."[4]

Once the ideal became crystallised, he started transmitting it through the powerful medium of his Urdu and Persian poetry. In his poem جوابِ شکوہ (Answer to the complaint), Allah commanded to the faithful to realise that:

قوم مذہب سے ہے مذہب جو نہیں تم بھی نہیں
جذب باہم جو نہیں محفل انجم بھی نہیں
قوتِ عشق سے ہر پست کو بالا کر دے
دہر میں اسمِ محمدؐ سے اجالا کر دے
کی محمدؐ سے وفا تو نے تو ہم تیرے ہیں
یہ جہاں چیز ہے کیا لوح و قلم تیرے ہیں

(Religion is the basis of nationalism. If the stars are not bound to each other,
there is no star-lit sky.

Arise! emancipate the wretched of the earth by the power of *Ishq*

and enlighten the world with the name of Muhammad.(peace be upon him).

Be you faithful to Muhammad (peace be upon him), and we yield ourself to you;

not this world alone - the Tablet and the pen your prize shall be).

In his short poem entitled مذہب (Religion) he addressed his fellow Muslims on the subject of nationalism in a moving melodious tone:

اپنی ملت پر قیاس اقوامِ مغرب سے نہ کر
خاص ہے ترکیب میں قومِ رسولِ ہاشمیؐ
ان کی جمعیت کا ہے ملک و نسب پر انحصار
قوتِ مذہب سے مستحکم ہے جمعیت تری
دامنِ دیں ہاتھ سے چھوٹا تو جمعیت کہاں
اور جمعیت ہوئی رخصت تو ملت بھی گئی

(Do not compare your nation with the nations of the West

because, the nation of the Prophet of Islam is of a different mould.

Western nationalism is based on territory or race

but your nationalism gets its strength from the power of religion.

With the loosening of the religious

hold your unity as a distinct nation will be lost.)

In his Persian *Masnavies* entitled: اسرارِ خودی (Secrets of the Self) and رموزِ بے خودی (Mysteries of Selflessness), first published in 1915, Iqbal rejected the political creed of territorial nationalism by citing examples from the teachings and the practice of the Holy Prophet:

عقدہء قومیتِ مسلم کشود
از وطن آقائے ما ہجرت نمود
حکمتش یک ملتِ گیتی نورد
بر اساس کلمۂ تعمیر کرد

آں چناں قطع اخوت کردہ اند
بر وطن تعمیر ملت کردہ اند
تا وطن را شمع محفل ساختند
نوع انساں را قبائل ساختند

قوم تو از رنگ و خوں بالاتر است
قیمتِ یک اسودش صد احمر است
فارغ از باب و اُم و اعمام باش
ہمچو سلمانؓ زادۂ اسلام باش
ملتِ ما شانِ ابراہیمی است
شہدِ ما ایمانِ ابراہیمی است
گر نسب را جزوِ ملت کردۂ
رخنہ درکارِ اخوت کردۂ

نیست از روم و عرب پیوندما
نیست پابندِ نسب پیوندما

دل بہ محبوبِ حجازی بستہ ایم
زیں جہت با یک دگر پیوستہ ایم
عشقِ اُو سرمایۂ جمعیت است
ہمچو خوں اندر عروقِ ملت است

(Our Master, migrating from his fatherland,
Resolved the knot of Muslim nationhood,
His wisdom founded one community -
The world its parish.
Those who adopted country as
the basis of nationalism have shattered
the fabric of human fraternity.
By making country an object of veneration
they have divided human unity into tribes.

Your nation is above the considerations of colour and blood;

the price of one black man is a hundred red men.

Reject blood relationship as a principle of human superiority

and follow the way of Salman Farsi who had exclaimed:

I am the son of Islam. Become a destroyer of Idol like Abraham.

If racial pride is the basis of nationalism
then forget about the concept of human brotherhood.
I do not belong to Rome and Arabia,
nor I take pride in the concept of racial superiority.
Follow the way of your Prophet and get united.
Love of the Prophet is the source of your unity.

 

Make this love as the cementing force of your nationhood.)

It was for his spiritual ideals that the Prophet of Islam migrated from the land of his birth and adopted Medina as his permanent abode. The Muslims of India must follow this example from the life of Prophet Muhammad by their refusal to sacrifice their religious identity on the alter of the territorial nationalism *i.e.* composite Indian nationalism. In his historic presidential address, delivered at the annual session of the All-India Muslim League at Allahabad on the 29th December, 1930 he rejected the Western concept of a composite Indian nationalism in an unapologetic manner. He argued with the full emphasis on his command that:

> "The religious ideal of Islam is organically related to the social order which it has created. The rejection of the one will eventually involve the rejection of the other. Therefore, the construction of a polity on national lines, if it means a displacement of the Islamic principle of solidarity, is simply unthinkable to a Muslim. --- I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-government within the British Empire or without the British Empire appears to me the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India ---- I, therefore, demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim State in the best interest of India and Islam".[5]

Assuring full cooperation to other nations of the Indian subcontinent, Iqbal observed:

> "As far as I have been able to read the Muslim mind, I have no hesitation in declaring that if the principle that Indian Muslim is entitled to full and free development on the lines of his own culture and tradition in his own Indian homelands, is recognised as the basis of a permanent communal settlement, he will be ready to stake his all for the freedom of India- - - - - the idea need not alarm the Hindus or the British. The life of Islam as a cultural force in this country very largely depends on its centralisation in a specified territory."[6]

This total rejection of the concept of composite Indian nationalism and the most unambiguous articulation of the concept of a separate Muslim nationalism annoyed the Hindus as well as the British. The British Prime Minister Ramsay McDonald "was highly displeased with the views expressed by Iqbal."[7] A despatch from London, published in the *Leader*, Allahabad, stated that "the British as well as Indian circles in the Round Table Conference expressed resentment against what is called an assault made by Iqbal on the idea of an all-India constitution being worked out there."[8] The Muslim leadership of the day did not even dared to discuss the philosophical foundations of the concept of a separate Muslim nationhood in India. But Iqbal was emphatic in the defence of his line of thinking. Addressing the National League of London on December 10, 1932, he asserted:

"The point of Muslims of India is that, as a people representing a distinct historical tradition and homogeneity, which is not possessed by any other community in India, as such people they want to live, and develop on their own cultural lines. This is the principle that underlies their demands. On account of these demands our countrymen say we are Pan-Islamic and not patriotic enough and they also say that we are communalistic. Now with regard to communalism and Pan-Islamism I want to say a few words to you. If a man belongs to a cultural community, he feels that it is his duty to protect that culture. In that case I appeal to you whether you will look upon such a man as unpatriotic. I think it is the duty of every Briton to protect his country if his country is in danger. In the same way it is the duty of every Musalman to protect his culture, his Faith, if he finds that these things are not safeguarded. After all it is a man's faith, his culture, his traditions, which are worth living for and dying for. Islam does not recognise the differences of race, of caste or even of sex. It is above time and above space, and it is in this sense that mankind are accepted as brothers. We are 80,000,000 in India and we want to protect our own culture and our own historical tradition."[9]

When Muhammad Ali Jinnah returned from London and initiated the task of the reorganisation of the All-India Muslim League, Iqbal extended his total support to Jinnah and worked as his loyal soldier. This was the time of the closest political cooperation between these two greatest

leaders of Muslim India. Referring to Pundit Jawaharlal Nehru's address to the All-India National Convention, Iqbal suggested to Jinnah that:

> "You should immediately hold an All-India Muslim Convention in Delhi to which you should invite members of the new Provincial Assemblies as well as other prominent Muslim leaders. To this convention you must restate as clearly and as strongly as possible the political objective of the Indian Muslims as a distinct political unit in this country. It is absolutely necessary to tell the world both inside and outside India that the economic problem is not the only problem in the country. From the Muslim point of view the cultural problem is of much greater consequence to most Indian Muslims. At any rate it is not less important than the economic problem. If you could hold this convention, it would test the credentials of those Muslims Legislators who have formed parties contrary to the aims and aspirations of Indian Muslims. It would further make it clear to the Hindus that no political device, however subtle, can make the Indian Muslim lose sight of his cultural entity."[10]

In another letter to Jinnah dated 28th May, 1937, Iqbal dwelt at length on the question of Muslim poverty with special reference to Pundit Nehru's atheistic socialism. In view of the importance of the letter, I am tempted to give a long extract, which is as follows:

"The League will have to finally decide whether it will remain a body representing the upper classes of Indian Muslims or Muslim masses who have so far, with good reason, taken no interest in it. Personally I believe that a political organisation which gives no promise of improving the lot of the average Muslim cannot attract our masses. Under the new constitution (of 1935) the higher posts go to the upper classes; the smaller ones to the friends or relatives of the ministers. In other matters too our political institutions have never thought of improving the lot of Muslims generally. The problem of bread is becoming more and more acute. The Muslim has begun to feel that he has been going down and down during the last 200 years. Ordinarily he believes that his poverty is due to Hindu money-lending or capitalism. The perception that it is equally due to foreign rule has not yet fully come to him. But it is bound to come. The atheistic socialism of Jawaharlal is not likely to receive much response from the Muslims. The question therefore is; how is it possible to solve the problem of Muslim poverty? And the whole future of the League depends on the League's activity to solve this question. If the League can give no such promises I am sure the Muslim masses will remain indifferent to it as before. Happily there is a solution in the enforcement of the Law of Islam and its future development in the light of modern ideas. After a long and careful study of Islamic Law I have come to the conclusion that

if this system of Law is properly understood and applied, at least the right to subsistence is, secured to everybody. But the enforcement and development of the *Shariat* of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim state or states. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India. If such a thing is impossible in India the only other alternative is a civil war which as a matter of fact has been going on for sometime in the shape of Hindu-Muslim riots. I fear that in certain parts of the country, *e.g.* N.W. India, Palestine may be repeated. Also the insertion of Jawaharlal's socialism into the body politic of Hinduism is likely to cause much bloodshed among the Hindus themselves. The issue between social democracy and Brahmanism is not dissimilar to the one between Brahmanism and Buddhism. Whether the fate of socialism will be the same as the fate of Buddhism in India I cannot say. But it is clear to my mind that if Hinduism accepts social democracy it must necessarily cease to be Hinduism. For Islam the acceptance of social democracy in some suitable form and consistent with the legal principles of Islam is not a revolution but a return to the original purity of Islam. The modern problems therefore are far easier to solve for the Muslims than for the Hindus. But as I have said above in order to make it possible for Muslim India to solve these problems it is

necessary to redistribute the country and to provide one or more Muslim states with absolute majorities. Don't you think that the time for such a demand has already arrived? Perhaps, this is the best reply you can give to the atheistic socialism of Jawaharlal Nehru."[11]

It is obvious from the contents as well as the rationale of the letter that Iqbal attempted to persuade Jinnah to adopt the creation of separate and sovereign Muslim homeland as the political programme of the Muslim League, which Jinnah finally did adopt in less than three years.

Iqbal's letters to Jinnah had become the only medium of communication between the two leaders because of the ill-health of Iqbal. Iqbal was an acute and sensitive observer of the rapid and dramatic pace of events on the political horizon of Muslim India. He had pinned all his hopes on Jinnah. Hence the constant flow of his letters, marked: "Private and confidential" - to Jinnah from his death-bed.

It was again from his death-bed that Iqbal responded to the statement of Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madni published in the daily newspaper *Ehsan* (Lahore) on the 9th of March 1938. The Maulana had advised the Muslims to accept the creed of Indian nationalism because "nations are formed by lands". Iqbal felt extremely grieved to read the statement made by the leading light of the *Ulama*. His poetic response was immediate and spontaneous:

عجم ہنوز نداند رموز دیں ورنہ
زدیوبند، حسین احمد، ایں چہ بوالعجمی است
سرود برسر منبر کہ ملت از وطن است
چہ بے خبر زمقامِ محمد عربی است
بمصطفیٰ برساں خویش را کہ دیں ہمہ اوست
اگر بہ اُو نہ رسیدی تمام بولہبیست

(The '*Ajam* has not yet mastered the secrets of the faith; otherwise we would

not have seen the strange spectacle of Deoband producing a Hussain Ahmed.

He sermonised from the top of the pulpit that it is the territory that makes a nation;

How ignorant he is of the standpoint of Muhammad of Arabia!

You must reach out to Muhammad (peace be upon him), the chosen one, for he personifies Islam;

If you do not reach out to him, you follow the Father of the Flame (Abu Lahab))

The publication of this short, illuminating poem created an unprecedented commotion in the length and breadth of Muslim India and the Maulana had to defend himself in public rallies. This generated a controversy on the question of Islam and nationalism in the context of Muslim demand for the creation of separate Muslim homeland. It was the destiny of Iqbal to pronounce the final verdict on this religio-political issue. His last political statement was published just a few days before he breathed his last. During the course of this statement he invited the

religious devines of Muslim India to follow the footprints of the Holy Prophet:

> "Those who accepted Muhammad's leadership, became part and parcel of the Muslim community, irrespective of the fact whether they belonged to his own nation or other nations. Formerly they had been slaves of land and race, but land and race now became their slaves:
>
> کسے کو پنجہ زد ملک و نسب را
> نداند نکتۂ دین عرب را
> اگر قوم از وطن بودے، محمدؐ
> نہ دادے دعوت دیں بولہب را
>
> (Any one, who attached himself to his "country" or "pedigree", could not understand the real spirit of Islam.

If a nation could exist only by the love for one's country, Muhammad (peace be upon him) would not have invited "Bu-Lahab" to the faith of Islam).

> It was a very easy course for Muhammad (peace be upon him) to tell Abu Lahab, Abu Jahl, or the unbelievers of Mecca that they could stick to their idol-worship while he himself would hold fast to the worship of God and that they could together form an Arabian unity by virtue of the factors of race and land common to them both. God forbid, but if he had adopted this course, it would certainly had done him credit as a patriot

but not as the last Prophet. The ultimate purpose of the prophetic mission of Muhammad is to create a form of society, the constitution of which the Prophet received from God. The object is to purify the nations of the world of the abuses which go by the name of time, place, land, nation, race, genealogy, country, etc., although the differences of nations, tribes, colours and languages are at the same time acknowledged. It is thus to bestow upon man the spiritual idea which at every moment of his life remains in constant contact with eternity. This is where Muhammad stands and this is the ideal of the Muslim community."[12]

These new ideas concerning the destiny of Muslim India, in particular, and Muslim world in general, which had stirred the mind of young Iqbal, way back in the year 1907 continued to grow over the years and finally culminated into a clear cut ideology in 1938.

Notwithstanding the advocacy of Indian nationalism on the basis of Islam by the leading *Ulama,* the overwhelming majority of the Indian Muslims adopted the path of a separate Muslim nationalism as the only way leading to their salvation. Less than two years after the death of Iqbal, All-India Muslim League resolved to struggle for the creation of separate Muslim homeland on the ideological foundations laid by their poet-philosopher, Allama Muhammad Iqbal.

# Notes and References


1. Dar, B.A (ed.): *Letters and Writings of Iqbal,* pp. 58, 59, Karachi 1967.
2. Iqbal, Javed (ed.): *Stray Reflections,* p. 41, Lahore, 1961.
3. *Ibid.*, p.44
4. Vahid, Syed Abdul, (ed.): *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal,* pp. 59, 60. Lahore, 1964.
5. *Ibid.* , pp. 171, 173.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 169, 171.
7. *Indian Daily Mail,* (Bombay), December 31, 1930.
8. Letter, dated January 4, 1931. Cited by Khurshid, Abdussalam: *History of the Idea of Pakistan,* Islamabad, p. 76.
9. Speech delivered on Dec. 15, 1932 before National League London, included in Dar, B.A.: *Letters and Writings of Iqbal,* Lahore, 1967.
10. Jinnah, M.A.: *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah,* Lahore, 1944, pp. 13, 14, - Letter dated 2nd March, 1937.
11 *Ibid.*, pp. 16-20. Letter dated May, 1937.

# 3

## UNIVERSAL ACCLAMATION OF IQBAL AS THE SPIRITUAL FATHER OF PAKISTAN

It was none other than the Quaid-i-Azam himself who was the first to acknowledge Allama Muhammad Iqbal as the spiritual father of Pakistan. In his foreword to *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*, he has stated:

> "The letters which form part of this booklet were written to me by the sage, philosopher and national poet of Islam, the late Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal, during the period May 1936 to November 1937, a few months before his death. This period synchronises with a very eventful period in the history of Muslim India. - - - - -. It was a great achievement for Muslim League that its lead came to be acknowledged by both the majority and minority provinces. Sir Muhammad Iqbal played a very conspicuous part, though at the time not revealed to public, in bringing about this consummations - - - - I think these letters are of very great historical importance, particularly those which explain his

session of the All-India Muslim League in December 1930. Iqbal's conception was not only clear but comprehensive in the sense that it was based on both geographical and ideological factors. What was most noteworthy in Iqbal's conception was the ideological basis of his state. His idea was not inspired by fear or hostility towards the Hindus. At this stage it should also be made clear that Iqbal's conception of Islamic State was extremely liberal and flexible. It not merely indicates how liberal Iqbal was in his conception of Islam, but also that he was in favour of Muslims continuing in the liberal and tolerant traditions that Indian Islam had nurtured so assiduously in contrast to its Arabian counterpart."[5]

The ideological dimension of Iqbal's concept of Pakistan has furthered been elaborated by Professor Aziz Ahmed, while defining "Iqbal's Theory of Pakistan". During his insightful analysis of Iqbal's ideal state he has observed:

"While this ideal state was Iqbal's dream of future, his immediate concern was the fate of Muslims in the slowly emerging pattern of self-government in India. Here he once again modified his theory of 'cognizable centre' to apply to the specific problem of Muslim India: a Muslim majority in the north-west and a Muslim Diaspora in the rest of the sub-continent. Whereas the Ka'ba remained the symbolic 'cognizable centre' of the entire

Muslim world, a regional centre in a politically defined regional state was necessary for the survival of Muslims in sub-continent. The Muslim majority areas thus constituted a politically cognizable centre in relation to the Diaspora. This marked a retreat from Iqbal's original position, his idealistic denunciation of regionalism. He had now come to the conclusion that while a universal Muslim caliphate was impracticable in the modern world, the only tangible form the political expression of pan-Islamism could take was that of multinationalism, realizing itself in regional national states. Iqbal first put forward a proposal for the creation of a separate state in India in 1930, in his presidential address to the annual session of Muslim League. This was a significant pronouncement, unapologetically, forecasting the 'two-nation theory' which had been vaguely suggested by Sayyid Ahmed Khan and Maulana Muhammad Ali earlier and was finally developed by Jinnah."[6]

Elaborating upon the ideological orientations of the idea of Pakistan, Waheed-uz-Zaman points out that:

"The importance of Iqbal's influence in breaking the rough Muslim inertia can searcely be exaggerated. He gave his co-religionists a new intellectual basis and new vision. He inspired fresh hopes and vigorous confidence. He has been called the father of the idea of a separate state for the Muslims of India and the

poet-philosopher of Pakistan - - - -. The demand for a separate state was not a mere escape and a refuge from Hindu majority. It was the outcome of his philosophical thought based on his religious belief that Muslims belong to a world-wide spiritual fraternity. The secession from the rest of India would enable them to become a part of the bigger whole to which they belonged."[7]

Dr. Ishtiaq Hussain Qureshi regards Iqbal as the harbinger of Pakistan. He states in his book entitled *The Struggle for Pakistan* that:

"Sir Muhammad Iqbal is generally credited with initiating the idea of separation. Iqbal was the first important public figure to propound the idea from the platform of the Muslim League- - - - some writers have taken Iqbal to mean that he wanted only a consolidated Muslim unit within the confederation of India but it is incorrect. If that were so, he would not have mentioned self-government within British empire or without it. A resolution of the All Parties Muslim Conference was, in his view, a demand for the autonomy of Islam within a free India. That is the reason why he prefaced his remark by saying that personally he would like to go even further which could mean only independence. In the Third Round Table Conference Iqbal pleaded that there should be no central government in the sub-continent and

that the provinces should be autonomous and independent dominions."[8]

By the foregoing survey of history it is clear beyond any doubt that the generally held belief that Iqbal is the spiritual father of Pakistan is a historical fact. Orientalists and Islamists of repute regard Iqbal as the patron saint and spiritual god-father of Pakistan. Here I would like to mention only two such scholars - one from the United States of America and the other from Russia. Freeland Abbott is of the view that Iqbal's idea animated the movement to found Pakistan:

> "After the partition of India, Iqbal, who as the president of the Muslim League in 1930 had expressed a demand for "the formation of a consolidated Muslim state in the best interest of India and Islam" was elevated to some thing like the patron saint of Pakistan. His ideas were highly publicised and his writings were extensively quoted - by almost everyone.-- - - - Sir Muhammad Iqbal, searching to ensure Muslim solidarity in his time, urged the creation of separate Muslim state in north west India. Such a step, he argued in his presidential address before the annual meeting of the Muslim League in 1930, will give Islam "an opportunity to rid itself of the stamp the Arabian imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilize its law, its education, its culture, and to bring them into closer contact with its original spirit and with the spirit of modern times." It would also remove the Muslims from the Hindu political

sphere in which, as he carefully pointed out, if India should become a democratic state, they would always be a minority.[9]"

The famous Russian scholar of Islamic studies, L. R. Gordon-Polonskaya concludes her paper on "Ideology of Muslim Nationalism" on the assertion that:

"Iqbal's philosophical conceptions led him to the conclusion that his ideals of equality and freedom could be embodied only in an Islamic state, and that consequently the Muslims of India had no other course but self-determination and the creation of Pakistan. It was a logical outgrowth of his concept of Muslim nationalism. It was most fully reflected in the political speeches, letters, and political tracts of his last period of activity (the 1930s)."[10]

It is obvious from the above narration, citing a wide range of authors, historians and political scientists, orientalists and Islamists that all of them trace the origin of the concept of Pakistan to Allama Iqbal's Allahabad address of 1930. Chaudhri Muhammad Ali, a former Prime Minister of Pakistan has stated in his book entitled *The Emergence of Pakistan*:

"In December, 1930, the Muslim League held its annual session in Allahabad. The Muslim League at that time was not remarkable for its activity, and the session would have passed unnoticed but for the unusual fact that it was presided over by a poet who delivered an

unusual address. Muhammad Iqbal is by common consent the greatest poet-philosopher that Muslim India has produced. In his presidential address, Iqbal surveyed the political scene and illuminated it with philosophic insight. In striking words he indicated the goal toward which the conscious and unconscious strivings of the Muslim community were taking them. For the first time a person with high intellectual stature and prestige propounded a scheme for the establishment of a Muslim state from an authoritative platform. A new angle of vision has transformed the picture. Instead of looking upon themselves as a minority, desperately seeking safeguards for their cultural, economic, and political interests, Muslims saw themselves as a nation entitled to build a just social order on the basis of Islam in their own homeland."[11]

The main point that Chaudhri Muhammad Ali has aptly highlighted has often been ignored by the historians and the political scientists. The revolutionary change that was brought about by Allama Iqbal was the transformation of a helpless and leaderless Muslim minority into a well-defined and a determined nation. This was the historic turning point in Muslim India. From now onward the Muslim struggle was aimed at the establishment of a separate homeland. Instead of seeking safeguards from the Hindus and the British they sought to get their right to national self-determination. This is the real significance of Iqbal's Allahabad address of 1930. This is what made him the spiritual father of Pakistan - a fact that was recognised by Richard Simons, among others, in his book entitled

*Making of Pakistan*, published within two years of the creation of Pakistan. Elaborating upon the theme of the Muslim Renaissance, he writes:

> "Muhammad Iqbal is to-day universally recognised in Pakistan as the great poet and prophet of the nation. There can hardly be a school or college in the country where his poems and his philosophy are not part of the prescribed curriculum. - - - Iqbal was a Muslim first and last, who was concerned with the transformation of Islamic society, irrespective of national boundaries, rather than with creating a nation. But his prestige was so great and his enthusiasm so boundless that he became a political leader- - - -. In two important speeches towards the end of his life he appeared to foresee the development of Pakistan. In 1930 in his presidential address to the Muslim League, ten years before the League adopted the programme of Pakistan, he demanded a separate Muslim state. It was his policy of the 'mass contact' which Jinnah was to adopt with such success a few years later, and which converted the Muslim League from a middle class to a popular party."[12]

There are, however, some individuals in Pakistan, who hate to associate the prestige of Allama Iqbal with the concept of Pakistan. Hence the recent attempts to draw into dispute the universally acknowledged fact of the origin of the concept of Pakistan. Books have been published, both in English and in Urdu, denying Iqbal and glorifying

Chaudhry Rahmat Ali instead. These books and the nascent controversy woven around these books is the subject of the next chapter.

## Notes and References


1. Jinnah, Muhammad Ali (ed.): *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*, Lahore, 1942, pp. 3-7.
2. Monthly *Sub Ras* (Iqbal Number), Hyderabad Deccan, June 1938, p. 67.
3. For details see Ahmed Saeed: *Iqbal aur Quaid-e-Azam* (Urdu), Lahore, 1977, pp. 86-117.
4. Ahmed Saeed: *Writings of the Quaid-e-Azam*, Lahore, 1976, p. 31.
5. Saeed, K.B.: *Pakistan: the Formative Phase*, Oxford-London, 1960, pp. 103-105.
6. *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan*, Oxford, 1967, pp. 158-162.
7. *Towards Pakistan*, Lahore, 1978 (Third edition) pp. 143-145.
8. 4th edition, Karachi, 1979, pp. 117-119; first published in 1965.
9. *Islam and Pakistan*, New York, 1968, pp. 163.165.
10. Malik, Hafeez (editor) : *Iqbal, Poet-Philosopher of Pakistan*, New York, 1971, p. 132.
11. Published by Columbia University Press, New York, 1967, p. 25.
12. First published by Faber and Faber, London in 1949. Citation is from the third edition, Karachi, 1976, pp. 38-41.

# 4

## THE NEW CONTROVERSY

It is ironic to note that the official historian of Pakistan, during the Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto regime, was the first historian to deny Iqbal the status of the spiritual father of Pakistan and to credit Chaudhry Rahmat Ali with the authorship of the concept of Pakistan instead. In his preface to *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali* Dr. K.K. Aziz, the then Chairman of the National Commission on Historical and Cultural Research, Islamabad, highlighted Chaudhry Rahmat Ali's role in the development of the idea of Pakistan in the following words:

> "As a thinker he laid down and propounded certain principles which the All India Muslim League borrowed from him without acknowledgement. He argued for the two-nation theory with conviction and skill. He was the first to make a clearcut demand for a separate and independent Muslim state in South Asia and to make out a persuasive case for it."[1]

K.K. Aziz continues:

> "The most remarkable feature of Rahmat Ali's demand is the unmistakable manner in which he

proclaimed the Muslims to be separate nation. None before him had announced this so clearly, so insistently and so rationally. When, later, the Muslim League came to advocate its Pakistan plan, it could not think of any new argument and was content to repeat and elaborate his points. Iqbal did not believe in the two-nation theory; on the contrary, he had set out to create an Indian nation and an Indian unity."[2]

This view is based on stark ignorance of Iqbal's poetic work as well as political formulations on the concept of a separate Muslim nationhood. Since most of our historians and political scientists do not go beyond the famous Allahabad address of 1930, let us refer to this basic political document of the Pakistan movement. Expressing dismay on the results of the first Round Table Conference Iqbal observed:

> "The Prime Minister of England apparently refuses to see that the problem of India is international and not national. Obviously he does not see that the model of British democracy cannot be of any use in a land of many nations."[3]

Again Iqbal asserts in a warning tone:

> "No Muslim politician should be sensitive to the taunt embodied in that propaganda words -- communalism -- expressly devised to exploit what the Prime Minister calls British democratic sentiments, and to mislead England into assuming a state of things which does not exist in India. Great interests are at stake. We are 70

> millions and far more homogeneous than any other people in India. Indeed the Muslims of India are the only Indian people who can fitly be described as a nation in the modern sense of the word. The Hindus, though ahead of us in almost all respects, have not yet been able to achieve the kind of homogeneity which is necessary for a nation, and which Islam has given you as a free gift."[4]

Two things are absolutely clear from the above extracts from the Allahabad address of 1930. Iqbal had asserted in an un-ambiguous and unapologetic manner that: a) India is not a country; it is a continent ("India is Asia in miniature.") and therefore a constitution based on the notion of a united India is not at all a democratic constitution, b) the Muslims of India are a separate nation whose final destiny is separate national homelands.

The concept of a separate Muslim nationalism was crystal clear in Iqbal's writings as early as 1911. Iqbal's lecture on "Muslim Community" as printed in the *Report on the Census of India* (1911, Vol. XIV, pp. 162-164) is an ample testimony to the fact. During the course of the lecture, Iqbal stated categorically that:

> "The essential difference between the Muslim Community and other communities of the world consists in our peculiar conception of nationality. It is not the unity of language or country or the identity of economic interest that constitutes the basic principles of our nationality. It is because we all believe in a

certain view of the universe, and participate in the same historical tradition that we are members of the society founded by the Prophet of Islam . . . . . . . . . .. The point that I have tried to bring out in the above remarks is that Islam has a far deeper significance for us than merely religion; it has a peculiar national meaning so that our communal life is unthinkable without a firm grasp of the Islamic principle. The idea of Islam is, so to speak, our eternal home or country in which we live, move, and have our being. To us it is above every thing else as England is above all to the Englishman and "Deutschland ueber Alles" to the Germans." [5]

This idea of a separate Muslim identity continued to grow and was formally presented in 1930 from the platform of the All-India Muslim League. Unfolding the ideology of a separate Muslim nationalism, Iqbal warned the delegates of the annual convention of the League:

"Nor should the Muslim leaders and politicians allow themselves to be carried away by the subtle but placid arguments that Turkey and Iran and other Muslim countries are progressing on territorial national line. The Muslims of India are differently situated. The countries of Islam outside India are practically wholly Muslim in population. The minorities there belong, in the language of the Quran, "to the people of book." A Jew or a Christian or a Zoroastrian does not pollute the food of a Muslim by touching it, and

the law of Islam allows intermarriage with the people of the book." Indeed the first practical step that Islam took towards the realisation of a final combination of humanity was to call upon peoples possessing practically the same ethical ideal to come forward and combine. To-day it is being gradually realised in the countries of Islam in the shape of what is called Muslim Nationalism."[6]

In his book entitled *Pakistan, The Fatherland of the Pak Nation*, first published in 1947, Rahmat Ali has maintained that Iqbal has used the word state in his Allahabad address of 1930, not in the sense of a separate, sovereign state, but in that of a big province within and as part of the proposed Indian Federation."[7] Here, Rahmat Ali and his followers conveniently ignored the words "outside British Empire" as well as several passages of the address, most notably the following:

> "I cannot conceal from you the feeling that in the near future our community may be called upon to adopt an independent line of action, in such a crisis. And an independent line of action, in such a crisis, is possible only by a determined people, possessing a purpose. Is it possible for you to achieve the organic wholeness of a unified will? Yes, it is. Rise above sectional interests and private ambition, and learn to determine the value of your individual and collective action, however directed on material ends, in the light of the ideal which you are supposed to posses. Matter is diversity. Spirit is

light, life and unity. One lesson I have learnt from the history of Muslims. At critical moments in their history it is Islam that has saved Muslims not vice versa. If to-day you focus your vision on Islam and seek inspiration from the ever-vitalising idea embodied in it, you will be only reassembling your scattered forces, regaining your lost integrity, and thereby saving your self from total destruction."[8]

Thus, according to Iqbal, it is total and unshakable commitment to Islam that can save the Indian Muslims from "total destruction". They can only manifest this commitment in a separate and sovereign Muslim state. The creation of this consolidated Muslim State is:

> "in the best interest of Islam. For Islam it means an opportunity to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilize its law, its education, its culture, and to bring them into closer contact with its own original spirit and with the spirit of modern times."[9]

Needless to say that Islam can get this opportunity of rediscovering its original spirit and of bringing it "into closer contact with the spirit of modern times" only in an independent and sovereign Muslim state. Iqbal himself has put the record straight during the course of his presidential address delivered at the annual session of the All-India Muslim Conference at Lahore on 21st March 1932. While criticising the "rather hesitating behaviour of" the Muslim

delegates "at the final stage of the Round Table Conference" Iqbal asserted:

> "In my address to the All-India Muslim League I raised my voice against the idea of an all-India federation ....... I have reasons to believe, and had suspected this some days before I dissociated myself of our delegation, that our spokesmen were badly advised by certain English politicians."[10]

Thus, it is clear beyond any doubt, that in his Allahabad address of 1930 Iqbal had put forward a demand for the creation of a separate Muslim State. To confuse the concept of this state with an autonomous province within India is a tragic lack of understanding of both the letter and spirit of the Allahabad address.

"Historians and journalists" who are of the opinion that the pamphlet entitled *Now or Never*, circulated in the name of four students, namely Muhammad Aslam Khan, Rahmat Ali, Sheikh Muhammad Sadiq, and Inayat Ullah Khan from Cambridge on 28th January, 1933, is "no more than an exaggerated echo of Iqbal's 1930 suggestion"[11] sound correct. It is rather a restatement of the basic ideas embodied in Iqbal's Allahabad address in the slightly changed circumstances.

## Who is the Real Author of *Now or Never*

Some of the historians, K.K. Aziz most noted among them, have tried to project Chaudhry Rahmat Ali as the sole author of the circular letter entitled *Now or Never*, on the basis of the belated self-statement of Chaudhry Rahmat Ali. Several Pakistani, Indian, British and American historians and political scientists have maintained that *Now or Never* was the brain child of the four Muslim students whose signatures had appeared at the end of this declaration.[12]

Chaudhry Rahmat Ali not only proclaimed himself the author of *Now or Never* but also claimed that way back in 1915 he had given the idea of a separate Muslim State in India, in the inaugural address he delivered before the Bazm-i-Shibli, a student organisation in Islamia College, Lahore. K.K. Aziz has made the following observation on his claim:

> "So far it has not been possible to trace the original of this inaugural address, nor has any contemporary witness come forward to confirm the substance of Rahmat Ali's claim ....... Whatever the facts of the case, the curious thing is his long silence on the issue after this date. If he felt so strongly about a separate Muslim entity that he went to the extant of founding a society and giving the benefit of his thoughts, he should have continued his interest in the idea and spoken or written about it when he was living in Lahore ...... We have no means of knowing what happened to Rahmat Ali during this time."[13]

Rahmat Ali's own statement regarding the parentage of *Now or Never* is also disputed by several authors, including Mian Amiruddin, who has stated on the authority of a co-worker of Rahmat Ali that:

> "when Iqbal  to attend the Round Table Conference in 1931, some Muslim students at Cambridge including Rahmat Ali and Khawaja Rahim called on Iqbal. Iqbal was ill and, therefore, confined to bed in his apartment. The boys managed to reach him and told him that they had worked out a name for the Muslim state he had proposed in his Allahabad address of 1930. Then Rahmat Ali and Khawaja Abdur Rahim told him that it was Pakistan. Iqbal suggested to them that they should write each letter separately and place it in front of his eyes. The students did as they were told. They visited Iqbal again on the following day and Iqbal approved the name."[14]

The above statement has been made on the authority of Khawaja Abdur Rahim, who was a personal friend of Rahmat Ali and who "possesses about thirty letters of Rahmt Ali."[15] In his book *Ta'assurat wa Tasawwurat*, Abdul Waheed Khan has referred to his meeting with Iqbal in Bhopal in the year 1935, and has reminisced that when I asked Iqbal about the coinage of the word 'Pakistan', Iqbal answered that:

> "when I was in London for attending the Round Table Conference, Chaudhry Rahmat Ali came to see me once and asked me by what name the

government established under my Allahabad scheme would be called. On this I told him that if you take the first word of each province in north west India and the 'tan' of Baluchistan, you get a meaningful and nice world Pakistan. That will be the name of the government."[16]

It appears to me that the word 'Pakistan' was in Iqbal's mind more than twenty years before his famous Allahabad address. In his poem ترانۂ ملی (The Anthem of the Islamic Community) he celebrates the spread of Islam in the East as well as in the West and concludes the anthem with an inspiring reference to the glorious past and the bright future of Muslim India:

اے ارضِ پاک! تیری حرمت پہ کٹ مرے ہم
ہے خوں تری رگوں میں اب تک رواں ہمارا
سالار کارواں ہے میر حجازؐ اپنا
اس نام سے ہے باقی آرامِ جاں ہمارا
اقبال کا ترانہ بانگ درا ہے گویا
ہوتا ہے جادہ پیما پھر کارواں ہمارا

(O land of purity; we fell and died for your honour.
Our blood still courses through your viens.

The Lord of Hijaz is the leader of our community.
From this name comes the peace of our soul.

Iqbal's song is like the bell of the caravan. Once more our caravan measures the road.)

According to D.J. Matthews, the translator of the above-quoted anthem, this "poem was composed in 1910 and expresses Iqbal's changing views on nationalism. At this stage of life, Iqbal began to think in terms of Islamic internationalism rather than more narrow Indian nationalism, expressed in his earlier poems."[17] What concerns us here, is that as far back as 1910, the word "ارضِ پاک" (Arz-iPak) was already coined by Iqbal for the separate Muslim homeland, of his dreams. Rahmat Ali came under the influence of Iqbal when he joined Islamia College Lahore in 1915 as a student. During his stay at Lahore (1915-1930), he worked on the editorial staff of a number of newspapers and journals owned and edited by Iqbal's closest journalist friend, Munshi Muhammad Din Fauq. S.M. Ikram narrates that:

> "Iqbal, was able to make some valuable contacts during his stay in England. He had, for one thing many meetings with Mohammad Ali Jinnah, whom he was able to interest in his scheme for the future of India and who was to make this "poetic dream" a living reality. Another person who met him in England was Chaudhry Rahmat Ali, a Cambridge student, who had been greatly attracted by Iqbal's political proposals ...... The writer of these pages was in England from 1931 - 1933 and had frequent opportunities not only to meet Iqbal during his visits to the Round Table Conferences but also met Chaudhry Rahmat Ali and in fact worked with him in connection with

Iqbal Literary Association. At this time Chaudhry Rahmat Ali's attitude was that of an admirer of Iqbal, who was greatly impressed with Iqbal's proposal and had enthusiastically taken it up to give it a more concrete shape. A small group photograph of Iqbal with Rahmat Ali, Khawaja Abdur Rahim, Pir Ahsan-ud-Din and three others who were closely interested in the scheme was taken at the time. Rahmat Ali was an enthusiastic member of Iqbal Literary Association which arranged functions in honour of Iqbal, and it was on his insistence that the second reception was presided over by Sir Umar Hayat Tiwana, with whom Rahmat Ali used to stay during his visits to London. All the time Rahmat Ali was an enthusiastic admirer of Iqbal but, as stated by his contemporary and co-worker Mian Abdul Haq, President of Pakistan National Congress organised by the Muslim students at Cambridge, later his attitude changed. In July 1935, Rahmat Ali circulated another leaflet in which he proclaimed himself the founder of Pakistan National Movement. Mian Abdul Haq has described at length *(Nawa-i-Waqt,* Lahore, 1 July 1964) the changes in Rahmat Ali's mental make up from a study of major Nazi works, of which he knew many passages by heart, his criticism of the Quaid-i-Azam and his severe condemnation of the final arrangements for the division of the sub-continent."[18]

This piece of unchallengeable contemporary evidence is an ample proof of Chaudhry Rahmat Ali's fascination of

Iqbal. Another contemporary of Rahmat Ali is N.M. Khan who has thrown light on the activities of the Iqbal Literary Association. Says he:

> "Iqbal came to London in the winter of 1931, as a delegate to the Round Table Conference. When I first came to learn that Iqbal was expected to participate in the Round Table Conference, I held consultations with some of my friends and we formed ourselves into what came to be known as Iqbal Literary Association. Our association decided to present an address of welcome to the great poet of the East, and I was commissioned to approach him with the request to accept our address. He expressed himself very much averse to publicity. I argued that the move had been spontaneously initiated by Indian young men resident in England without anyone from outside urging them to do so, and that he should not do anything to damp their enthusiasm. He did finally agree. *Javid Nama* had not yet been published when I had come away from India. I asked Iqbal what the book contained. He said: 'I can give you an outline of the poem if you can manage to write down the words as I utter them'. He started dictating the words which I reproduce below. It took me nearly an hour to take down his words. They came out without effort and Iqbal had to pause only to give me time to write them down in my long-hand. When he came toward the end, he broke down and it was not until 15 minutes later that he became his normal self."[19]

This afternoon reception in honour of Iqbal was held at the Waldorf Hotel and was attended by, among others, Mahatma Gandhi, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, His Highness Agha Khan and Sir Umar Hayat Khan Tiwana. N. M. Khan incorporated the four page summary of *Javid Nama* as dictated by Iqbal into his own address of welcome, which he presented on the occasion but later on published it in the *Morning News*, Calcutta (Eid Number 1944) as an article of Iqbal on *Javid Namah* with his own note explaining the background in which he had the honour to take the dictation by Iqbal on his greatest Persian work. It is snot possible that, likewise, the 4 page leaflet entitled: *Now or Never* was also dictated by Iqbal to a group of undergraduate students in London, on whose name it was first circulated? Before reaching on any conclusion on this question we must have a pause to glance through Iqbal's philosophical discourses on Muslim politics as well as his political activities during the period between his Allahabad Address (29th December, 1930) and the publication of *Now or Never* (28th January 1933).

The bitterest reaction on the religio-political formulations of Iqbal on the question of a separate Muslim nationalism leading to establishment of separate Muslim homeland in South Asia, came from the British Prime Minister, who

> "was highly displeased with the views expressed by Iqbal. The British as well as Indian circles in the Round Table Conference expressed resentment against what it called an assault made by Iqbal on the idea of an all-India constitution being worked out there ........ The delegates at the Allahabad session of the All India Muslim League listened to the address but

neither discussed it nor expressed any opinion in favour or otherwise....... Three student workers from Calcutta, namely, Raghib Ahsan, Fazal Rasul Khan Afridi and S.M. Saleem, issued a joint statement in support of Iqbal's address and suggested the initiation of a "Muslim Ideal Fund" in order to finance a vigorous propaganda drive in support of Iqbal. The Hindu press maligned Iqbal on a very large scale. Throughout the sub-continent, Hindu papers carried on a tearing and raging campaign against him and even attributing statements which he never made."[20]

This, in brief, was the immediate reaction of the Allahabad address. Both the British and the Hindu leadership was up in arms against Iqbal. But the Muslim political elite was dumbfounded. Only the younger generation of the Muslim community responded enthusiastically to the inspirational leadership of Iqbal. Hence his prayer:

خرد کو غلامی سے آزاد کر
جوانوں کو پیروں کا استاد کر
جوانوں کو سوزِ جگر بخش دے
میرا عشق میری نظر بخش دے

(Make intellect free of slavery. Make the youth the teachers of the old.
Bestow upon the young the burning of the heart.
Bestow upon them my love and my sight.

(Translation: D.J. Matthews)

Iqbal's presidential address, delivered at the annual session of the All-India Muslim Conference at Lahore, on the 21st of March 1932, opens with the pertinent questions agitating the minds of the Muslim youth. This address is, in fact, in continuation of his Allahabad Address of 1930. In the meantime he had an opportunity to participate in the second Round Table Conference. On 15th of November he dissociated from the Muslim delegation because the members of the Muslim delegation "were badly advised by certain English politicians". .

Dismayed by the slavish attitude of the Muslim delegates as well as the imperial arrogance of the British authorities, Iqbal concentrated his energies on moulding British public opinion in favour of Muslim India's demands and transmitting his message to Muslim students who used to flock around him during his stay in London. The National League, London, invited members of the House of Lords and Commons to meet Iqbal. During the speech on this occasion, Iqbal said:

> "I suggested as a possible solution the formation of a large West Indian Muslim State while this suggestion of mine was not embodied in the demands of Muslims of India, my personal opinion still is that this is the only possible solution."[21]

Iqbal urged the Muslim Conference in his presidential address of 1932:

> "...to construct a fresh policy now that the premier's announcement at the last London

conference has again necessitated a careful survey of the whole situation. Your immediate duty is to prepare the whole community for the kind of self-sacrifice without which no self-respecting people can live an honourable life. The most critical moment in the history of India has arrived. Do your duty or cease to exist."[22]

This appears to me in continuation of the concluding remarks in the Allahabad Address of 1930, in which he had observed:

"I cannot conceal from you the feeling that in the near future our community may be called upon to adopt an independent line of political action to cope with the present crisis. And an independent line of action, in such a crisis is possible only by a determined people possessing a will focalised by a single purpose."[23]

In the course of fifteen months, the crisis had deepened beyond expectations. Consequently, Iqbal illuminated political avenues of Muslim India in a more determined tone:

"Asia cannot comprehend modern Western capitalism with its undisciplined individualism. The faith that you represent recognises the worth of the individual, and disciplines him to give away his all to the service of God and man. Its possibilities are not yet exhausted. It can still create a new world where the social rank of man is not determined by his caste or colour, or the amount of dividend he earns, but by the kind of

life he lives; where the poor tax the rich, where human society is founded not on the equality of spirits, where an untouchable can marry the daughter of a kind, where private ownership is a trust and where capital cannot be allowed to accumulate so as to dominate the real producer of wealth. This superb idealism of your faith, however, needs emancipation from the medieval fancies of the theologians and leggiest."[24]

It reminds me of his *magnum opus*, *Javid Namah*. During his ascent to beyond the spheres under the leadership of Rumi, during this heavenly journey, Iqbal had a poetic discourse on the nature and dynamics of the ideal Islamic state with the spirits of Jamal al-Din Afghani and Said Halim Pasha. The passage quoted below is a beautiful summary of the poetic discourse in prose. It is pertinent to note that *Javid Namah* appeared in the same year in which Iqbal delivered his Presidential Address to the Muslim Conference. Iqbal went on in the same prophetic tone:

"The whole community needs a complete overhauling of its present mentality in order that it may again become capable of feeling the urge of fresh desires and ideals. The Indian Muslim has long ceased to explore the depths of his own inner life. The result is that he has ceased to live in the full glow and colour of life, and is consequently in danger of an unmanly compromise with forces which, he is made to think, he cannot vanquish in open conflict."[25]

Thoroughly disappointed with the un-imaginative and coward politicians of Muslim India, he suggested among other things, the formation of youth leagues and gave a call to Muslim youth:

> "to rouse the progressive forces of the community and to organise their hitherto dormant energies, the flame of life cannot be borrowed from others; it must be kindled in the temple of one's own soul. Let then the fire of youth mingle with the fire of faith in order to enhance the glow of life and to create a new world of actions for our future generations."[26]

Iqbal had unshakable faith in the personal integrity and the political genius of Muhammad Ali Jinnah, whom he used to write letters marked "Private and confidential" on various auspects of the political crisis. Apart from him he saw only disillusionment and despair from the one end to the other on the political horizon. Young Muslim students provided him the only ray of hope. Writing on the origin an achievement of the Punjab Muslim Students Federation, Abdus Salam Khurshid has stated that:

> "Some of us met Dr. Mohammad Iqbal a number of times and discussed with him the political and organizational matters. While framing the constitution, we were on the horns of a dilemma - whether to tow the line of the Muslim League or to chalk out an independent course. When consulted on the point, Iqbal advised us to set a goal before us in regard to the Muslim destiny in the sub-continent ........

He came out with the proposal that we set as our goal the establishment of a Muslim National State based on the Muslim's right of self-determination and comprising the Punjab, N.W.F.P., Sind and Baluchistan and Kashmir. We readily agreed - rather welcomed it, and within a couple of days called a meeting of the executive, secured its approval and incorporated it in the constitution of the Punjab Muslim Students' Federation. There was a certain amount of hesitation on our part to advocate the goal publically, because the Muslim League leaders of the province other than Iqbal, would not talk of the subject because they stood for a united India."[27]

Iqbal was both a visionary and a pragmatist. The pragmatist in him looked for ways and means to translate his vision into a living actuality. Spreading his name and fame was not his concern. Spreading his ideas relating to future destiny of Muslim India in particular and to Islamic renaissance in general was one of his most vital and abiding concerns. So it did not matter who drafted the four page declaration entitled *Now or Never*, what did matter was that the message embodied in it. Its circulation in the name of four students was a brilliant strategy in the prevailing circumstances.

Read together with the Allahabad Address (1930) and the Presidential Address at the annual session of Muslim Conference (1932), *Now or Never* is a restatement of the basic ideas and core arguments of Iqbal, embodied in these two foundational documents of a separate Muslim

nationalism in India. Naturally the restatement was cast in the sentimental and agitational tone of young students. The purpose was to create a necessary alarm both in Muslim India and in Britain.

The thrust of the argument in *Now or Never* is against the idea of a federal constitution based on the concept of an all-India federation whose foundations were being laid in the Round Table Conference in progress in those days in London. Iqbal had rejected this idea and had dissociated from the Muslim delegation in the Minorities Committee of the conference. The sub-title of *Now or Never* is as follows:

"Are we to Live or Perish for ever?"

It brings to my mind the following lines of Iqbal's presidential address delivered at the annual session of the All-India Muslim Conference in 1932. Iqbal had sounded the warning:

> "Your immediate duty is to prepare the whole community for the kind of self-sacrifice without which no self-respecting people can live an honourable life. The most critical moment in the history of the Indian Muslims has arrived. Do your duty or cease to exist."[28]

In his Allahabad Address of 1930 Iqbal had asserted:

> "Religion is a power of the utmost importance in the life of individuals as well as states. Islam is itself destiny and will not suffer a destiny. Do not think that the problem I am indicating is a

purely theoretical one. It is a very living and practical problem calculated to affect the very fabric of Islam as a system of life and conduct. On a proper solution of it alone depends your future as a distinct cultural unit in India. Never in our history has Islam had to stand a greater trial than the one which confronts it to day."[29]

The declaration entitled *Now or Never* raised the same question:

"What safeguards can prevent the catastrophe of Muslim nation smarting and suffering eternally at the frustration of its every social and religious ideal? What safeguards can compensate our nation awakened to its national consciousness for the destruction of its distinct national status?"[30]

The declaration highlights the fact that:

"The ideals which move our thirty million brethren in faith living in the five Northern Provinces of India to make the highest sacrifices are fundamentally different from those which inspire the Hindus. These differences are not confined to the broad basic principles; far from it, they extend to the minutest details of our lives. We do not inter-dine; we do not inter-marry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress are different."[31]

This is a simple version of the following argument in favour of a separate Muslim nationhood in India, presented by Iqbal in his Allahabad Address of 1930:

> "The Muslims of India are differently situated. The countries of Islam outside India are practically wholly Muslim in population. The minorities there belong "to the people of the Book". There are no social barriers between Muslims and the "people of the Book". A Jew or Christian does not pollute the food of a Muslim by touching it, and the law of Islam allows inter-marriage with the people of the book."[32]

During the course of his Allahabad Address, Iqbal had also assured that:

> "The idea (of a separate Muslim homeland) need not alarm the Hindus or the British. India is the greatest Muslim country in the world. The life of Islam as a cultural force in this country very largely depends on its centralisation in a specified territory. This centralisation of the most living portion of the Muslims of India, whose military and police service has, notwithstanding unfair treatment from the British, made the British rule possible in this country, will eventually solve the problem of India as well as of Asia ..... The North-West Indian Muslim will prove the best defenders of India against a foreign invasion, be the invasion one of ideas or of bayonets."[33]

The views expressed in *Now or Never* on the above theme are identical with that of Iqbal's views, both in letter and spirit. The declaration assures that:

> "The Muslim Federation of North-West India would provide the bulwark of a buffer state against any invasion either of ideas or of arms from outside."[34]

Unlike the post-1935 writings of Rahmat Ali, the declaration contained in *Now or Never* ignores Bengal as well as Muslim princely states. Like Iqbal it concentrates only on the North-Western provinces of British India.

The vocabulary, language and the prose style of *Now or Never* has a marked difference with the vocabulary, language and the style of Rahmat Ali's post-1935 writings published in 1947 with the title *Pakistan: the Fatherland of the Pak Nation*. In fact it is the replica of the main arguments underlying Iqbal's Presidential Address as of 1930 and 1932. K.K. Aziz has stated that:

> "Considering that he (Rahmat Ali) passed both university examinations in the third division and took over 12 years to be admitted to the Bar, it appears that he was not a particularly good student.[35]

He was an ardent admirer of Iqbal but unfortunately came under the spell of fascism in 1935. One of his biographers, Nisar Ahmed Kisana has given a description

of his visit to Germany and his detailed close door meeting with Adolf Hitler in 1938. Mr. Kisana has disclosed in his book مطالبۂ پاکستان اور چوہدری رحمت علی (Demand for Pakistan and Chaudhry Rahmat Ali) that Rahmat Ali was accompanied by Mirza Muzaffar Beg and Chaudhry Rahmat Khan but he alone was granted a prolonged audience by Hitler. It is further claimed by the author that Rahmat Ali had convinced Hitler that the people of all the regions of Pakistan are Aryan in origin.[36] It was sometimes during this period of his fascistic inclination that he started formulations on his concept of Pakistan, which is fundamentally different from Iqbal's concept of Pakistan. He felt the urge of transmitting his ideas through the medium of English prose. But he was not confident about his ability to write. K.K. Aziz informs us that:

> "Rahmat Ali suspected that quality of his written English was not good enough. He inquired about the facilities available for coaching in the language, and on the recommendation of the secretary of the Cambridgeshire High School, arranged with one Leonard Nollingworth to correct his written work and guide him in the intricacies of grammar and syntax."[37]

Both the content and the style of *Now or Never* bears ample testimony to the fact that it is the product of the same mind which had earlier produced two of the most important documents of the movement for Pakistan, namely, the

Allahabad Address of 1930 and the Presidential Address of 1932. Iqbal was busy moulding public opinion in London in favour of his concept of separate Muslim homeland in the Indian sub-continent at the time of the circulation of *Now or Never*. Iqbal impressed upon members of the House of Lords and Commons as well as foreign diplomats, the significance of Muslim demands on December 15, 1932. During the course of his speech he argued:

> "The point of Muslims of India is that, as a people representing a distinct historical tradition and homogeneity, which is not possessed by any other community in India, as such people they want to live their own lives, and develop on their own cultural lines. On account of these demands your countrymen say we are pan-Islamic and not patriotic enough and they also say that we are communalistic .Now with regard to communalism and Pan-Islamism I want to say a few words to you. If a man belongs to a cultural community, he feels that it is his duty to protect that culture. In that case I appeal to you whether you will look upon such a man as unpatriotic. It is the duty of every Musalman to protect his culture, his faith, if he finds that things due to him are not safeguarded. After all, it is a man's faith, his culture, his traditions, which are worth living for and dying for."[38]

At the same time he was in contact with Muslim students of various universities of England. In all likelihood, he dictated the 4 page circular entitled *Now or Never* to a student or to a group of students in the same

manner in which he had dictated the contents of the write up on *Javid Namah* to N. M. Khan. As far as the self-statement of Rahmat Ali regarding the parentage of *Now or Never* is concerned it appears to be un-sound.

Rahmat Ali's concept of Pakistan as it was unfolded in his post-1935 writings is the concept of a Pakistan as integral part of an all-India federation renamed as Dinia. Obviously this is in direct negation of the concept of Pakistan as a separate and sovereign Muslim state.

## Notes and References

1. Aziz, K.K. (editor): *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali,* Vol. 1, Islamabad, 1978, p.1.
2. *Ibid.,* Introduction, p. xxii.
3. Vahid, Syed Abdul (editor): *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal,* Lahore, 1973, p. 188
4. *Ibid.,* pp. 189-190.
5. *Ibid.,* pp. 378-379.
6. *Ibid.,* p. 190.
7. Chaudhry Rahmat Ali: *Pakistan: The Fatherland of the Pak Nation,* Cambridge, 1947, p. 217.
8. *Thoughts and Reflections,* pp. 193-194.
9. *Ibid.,* p. 173.
10 *Ibid.,* pp. 200-201.
11. Aziz, K.K. (editor): *Complete Works,* introduction, p. xvii.
12. The writers who attribute the circular to Muslim "under-graduates" or "students" (in the plural) of Cambridge: Guy Wint, in: G. Schuster and Guy Wint, *India and*

*Democracy* (London. 1941). p. 181; R.C. Kingsburg, James I. McPherson. *et. al., Pakistan: A Compendium* (editor-in-chief, Raze R. Platt, American Geographical Society, New York, June 1961), p. 18 (mimeo, for limited distribution only): Holden Furber. "India" *Encyclopedia Americana*, 1961 ed., Vol. XV. p. 28f.; Aziz Ahmad, "Remarques sur les origines du Pakistan". *Orient*, no. 26 (1963). p. 22; Khalid b. Sayeed. *Pakistan: The Formative Phase, 1857-1948,* 2nd ed. London, 1968, p. 105; Jahanara Shahnawaz, *Father and Daughter: A Political Autobiography* (Lahore, 1971), p. 77; M.E. Chamberlain, *Britain and India: The Interaction of Two Peoples* (Newton Abbot, 1974), p. 215; and Muhammad Munir (former Chief Justice of Pakistan): *Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah* (Lahore, 1976), pp. 7-8.

13. Aziz, K. K. (editor): *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali,* op. cit. p. xiv.
14. Amiruddin, Mian, "More about the 'Forgotten Hero". *The Pakistan Times*, 10th May 1964.
15. *Ibid.*
16. Cited in Aziz, K. K.: *Rahmat Ali, A Biography*, Lahore, 1987, p. 332.
17. Iqbal, *op. cit.*, p. 154.
18. Ikram, S.M.: *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan,* fiirst published in 1950, third edition, Lahore, 1977, pp. 177-178.
19. *Javid Nama* with a Note by N. M. Khan included in Syed Abdul Vahid: *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal, op. cit*, pp. 225-226.
20. Khurshid, Abdus Salam: *History of the Idea of Pakistan,* Islamabad, 1976, pp. 77-80.
21. Dar, B.A., (ed.) *Letters and Writings*, op. cit., p. 75.
22. Vahid, (ed.): *Thoughts and Reflections*, op. cit., pp. 197-206.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 193.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 212-213.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 213.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 214-216.

27. Khurshid, Abdus Salam: *History of the Idea of Pakistan,* op.cit., pp. 94-95.
28. Vahid (ed.): *Thoughts and Reflections*, op.cit., p. 206.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 165.
30. Aziz, K.K. (ed.): *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali,* op. cit. p.8.
31. *Ibid.,* p. 6.
32. Vahid (ed.): *Thoughts and Reflections*, op. cit. p. 190.
33. *Ibid.*, op. cit. pp. 171-172.
34. Aziz, K. K. (ed.): *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali,* op. cit, pp. 7-8.
35. *Ibid.,* Introduction p. xii.
36. Kisana, Nisar Ahmed: *Mutalia-i-Pakistan aur Chaudhry Rahmat Ali* (Urdu), 1977, pp. 244-246.
37. Aziz, K.K.: *Rahmat Ali*, op. cit. p. 24.
38. Dar, B.A.: *Letters and Writings of Iqbal,* op.cit., pp. 71, 75.

# 5

## RAHMAT ALI'S PAK PLAN

In the later half of the year 1935 Chaudhry Rahmat Ali's ideas and attitudes underwent a sudden change. Until then he was an enthusiastic follower of Iqbal and a zealous member of Pakistan National Congress organised by the Muslim students at Cambridge. In July 1935, Rahmat Ali proclaimed himself the founder of Pakistan National Movement. His co-worker and President Pakistan National Congress, Mian Abdul Haq has attributed this abrupt change to his study of major Nazi works.[1] Shaukatullah Ansari is of the view that this change in the mental make up of Rahmat Ali is the result of British patronage:

> "At this time it was a general belief among Indian students at Cambridge that Chaudhry Rahmat Ali who was not pursuing any specific course of studies and had no ostensible means of support, but at the same time had ample funds for his some what luxurious entertainments of celebrities and propagandists activities, derived his inspiration and funds from India Office."[2]

Inspite of this "general belief" and his strong links with the more loyal than the king Unionists, i.e. Tiwanas in particular, Rahmat Ali appears to be an honest crusader. Once converted to the fascist ideology of Adolf Hitler, he had to depart from the liberal, democratic and egalitarian movement for Pakistan visualised by Iqbal and led by Jinnah. Rahmat Ali's Pak Plan as well as his strong denunciation of the Quaid-i-Azam are a natural outcome of his Nazi orientations. Khalid Hassan has given an accurate description of Rahmat Ali's Pak Plan in the following words:

> "Rahmat Ali's concept of Pakistan was nebulous, impractical and fantasy-ridden, comprising as his state did, the whole of Northwestern India, including Kashmir, the Kathiawar peninsula and Kutch, several enclaves deep within the present-day Uttar Pradesh, including the Palampur agency and the cities of Delhi and Lucknow. There were to be two independent states: Bangistan, made up of the entire provinces of Bengal and Assam and Osmanistan in the south, that being the Hyderabad state. These two states in the east and south were to form a federation with Pakistan in the northwest. Then there were the 243 principalities or smaller princely states or *rajwaras*, which were to become tributaries of Pakistan, as if Pakistan was an imperial power extracting tribute from lesser entities."[3]

And what was going to happen to the Hindus, the majority population of India, in the state which Rahmat Ali

was carving up sitting in the town of Cambridge? He had decided to divide the Hindus neatly into two categories: caste Hindus and others. They were to be herded together as if they were no better than cattle and pushed into a ghetto he called "Hanoodia." The Sikhs were to be relegated to a concentration camp-like enclave called "Sikhia." As for other races and religions, they were to be pushed into an encampment called "Hanadika". All these hundreds of millions of Hindus, Sikhs, Christians, Buddhists and animists were to remain utterly subservient to the chosen race that he called The Paks. The Muslims who were to find themselves living in any of the concentration enclaves were to be allotted six regions across the Indian mainland. Why they were not to be sent to Pakistan, Bangistan or Osmania, Rahmat Ali did not say. Nor did he explain how precisely India was going to be carved up and its majority population turned into virtual slaves without any political or human rights. India was also going to be renamed "Dinia."

According to K.K. Aziz, Rahmat Ali:

> "sees no alternative to a conversion of the whole of India to Islam and the creation of new Muslim Asia in which the old but never forgotton Islamic heritage would live again in yet greater splendour."[4]

In his pamphlet entitled "The Millat and the Mission : Seventh Continent of Dinia", first published in 1942, he has given a detailed outline of his Pak Plan. The seven commandments are as listed below:

"avoid minortyism; avow nationalism; acquire proportional territory; consolidate the individual nations; coordinate them under a Pak Commonwealth of Nations; convert India into Dinia; and organize Dinia and its dependencies into a Pakasia."[5]

Obviously, Rahmat Ali's Pak Plan seeks to establish seven Muslim strongholds within India and is in negation of the concept of separate Muslim homeland in areas where Muslims are already in majority. Rahmat Ali aims at the recreation of a Muslim empire through fascist tactics. That is why he condemned Muslim League's democratic approach to India's political crisis in the meeting of the Supreme Council of the Pakistan National Movement held in Karachi on 23rd March 1940, one day before the Lahore Resolution was moved and when the session had already begun its deliberations.

Rahmat Ali rejected the Lahore Resolution and denounced Muslim plans for the establishments of two separate Muslim states outside India on the basis of a separate Muslim nationalism. After the acceptance by the All India Muslim League of the 3rd June Plan, which was to create the state of Pakistan 10 weeks later, Rahmat Ali denounced the Quaid-i-Azam in an extremely intemperate and extravagantly abusive language. In his pamphlet entitled "The Greatest Betrayal" he has attempted to make a savage attack on the Quaid-i-Azam. Says he:

"In accepting the British Plan Mr. Jinnah has acted the Judas and betrayed, bartered, and dismembered the Millat. To prevent the verdict

of History, Mr. Jinnah is making desperate attempts to whitewash the betrayal. In fact, he is trying to do something more than that. He is befooling the Muslims into hailing their miserable fate as good fortune, and their betrayal by him as a blessing."[6]

Terming the creation of Pakistan as "the blackest and the bloodist treachery of our history", Rahmat Ali called upon the Muslims of "Dinia" to join the movement for the liberation of Muslim India under the banner of the All-India Dinia Milli Movement, which he had launched a couple of years ago, as a rival to the Movement for Pakistan.

Needless to say that Rahmat Ali's call proved to be of no consequence at all. His Dinia Milli Movement was only a movement on paper. As opposed to that, Pakistan movement was a popular democratic movement. Rahmat Ali's desperate call to dismember the state of Pakistan created by the unified will of Muslim India, under the liberal democratic leadership of the Quaid-i-Azam, fell on deaf ears.

# Notes and References


1. *Nawa-i-Waqt*, Lahore, July 1, 1964.
2. Quoted in Kirpal Singh, "The Origin of Pakistan", in: *The Spokesman*, New Delhi, weekly. Anniversary Number 1970.
3. Khalid Hassan, "The Quaid's Detractor", in: *The News International,* April 14, 1998. For more details of the Pak Plan, please see appendix 7.
4. Aziz, K.K: *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali*, op.cit., p. xxxv.
5. *Ibid.*, p. xxxiii.
6. Rahmat Ali: *Pakistan : The Fatherland of the Pak Nation,* Lahore 1978 edition, pp. 354-358.

# 6

## CONCLUSION

The Gujjar Community to which Rahmat Ali belonged started its attempts to add Chaudhry Rahmat Ali to the pantheon of political heroes of the Pakistan movement soon after his death in 1951. The انجمن مرکزیہ (Central Council) of the Gujjars of Pakistan held a meeting in Lahore on 27th May 1951 to chalk out a programme for honouring and perpetuating his name and memory. Another meeting took place on 4 January 1953 and decided to create a "Rahmat Ali Memorial". A Memorial Trust Committee was appointed under Chaudhri Abdur Rashid. The memorial was to take four forms: A Rahmat Ali Academy to conduct research on, پیامِ رحمت (The Message of Rahmat Ali), to construct buildings at various places in his memory, like a Rahmat Ali Hall, a Rahmat Ali Library, etc; Rahmat Ali scholarships and economic institutions named after him. The Gujjar magazine reminded the community of its duty in this direction and hoped that it would discharge its trust with devotion.[1] But as stated by K.K. Aziz, nothing happened.[2]

Clan loyalty, no doubt, is a noble sentiment. But distortion of history for the sake of creation of new myths is a useless exercise. Rahmat Ali's career can easily be divided into two distinct phases. During the pre-1935 phase he was an ardent admirer of Iqbal. He played an active role in Iqbal Literary Association in England and worked vigorously for propagation of Iqbal's political ideas relating to the destiny of Muslim India. During the post-1935 phase Rahmat ali drifted away from the democratic ideal and embraced fascism as his social and political creed. His political formulations during this period are overshadowed by an imperialistic vision of a united India renamed as the continent of "Dinia." Although he prefers to use the word 'Pakistan', but his concept of All-Dinia Federation has nothing to do with the concept of Pakistan as unfolded by Allama Iqbal in the year 1930. According to S.M. Ikram:

> "Iqbal whose contribution, made long before Rahmat Ali appeared on the scene, is a simple matter of printed record. He put forward the scheme in a concrete, tangible form at the principal political platform of Muslim India, gave the proposal the prestige of his illustrious name, and worked for its success. Not only he put forward the scheme and encouraged all who worked for it, but in the course of his stay in England, during informal conversation with the people he met, explained and argued for it. Naturally details of his informal conversations are not on record, but there are enough indications about the lines on which he was working. For example, in a letter addressed to the Quaid he refers to Lord Lothian's remarks made to him that his "scheme was the only

possible solution of the troubles of India but it would take 25 years to come." This remark, made before the end of 1932, would show that by then Iqbal had won over a man of Lord Lothian's calibre. Nearer home he had taken more active measures. At Lahore even before his address at Allahabad he got editorials written in the daily *Inqilab* urging that a conference to consider the problems of Muslim majority provinces should be held. For holding this conference a reception committee was organised, with Iqbal as chairman."[3]

Iqbal was a pragmatic statesman with poetic vision. He articulated and formally presented the ideology of a separate Muslim nationalism at Allahabad in 1930. From 1930 to his very last breath, Iqbal never missed an opportunity to enlighten and inspire Muslim youth for translating his vision into reality. Chaudhry Rahmat Ali was one of the most prominent young students in England who were attracted to Iqbal's ideas relating to the future of Muslim India.

It goes to the credit of Rahmat Ali that uptil the first half of 1935, he worked selflessly for propagation of Iqbal's concept of Pakistan with a missionary zeal. But afterwards, swayed by the Nazi ideology, he was led astray. Iqbal passed away in 1938. The All India Muslim League was finally led to adopt Iqbal's concept of Pakistan as its political programme in 1940, and acclaimed Iqbal as the spiritual father of Pakistan.

## Notes and References


1. *Gujjar Gazette*, 4-18 March 1954, p.4, cited by K.K. Aziz: *Rahmat Ali - A Biography*, Lahore 1987, p. 399.
2. *Ibid.*, p.399.
3. Ikram, S.M.: *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan*, 1977, p. 179.

# Appendices

# 1

## Iqbal's Allahabad Address*
## (Extracts)

Gentlemen, I am deeply grateful to you for the honour you have conferred upon me by inviting me to preside over the deliberations of the All-India Muslim League at one of the most critical moments in the history of Muslim political thought and activity in India. I have no doubt that in this great assembly there are men whose political experience is far more extensive than mine, and for whose knowledge of affairs I have the highest respect. It will, therefore, be presumptuous on my part to claim to guide an assembly of such men in the political decisions which they are called upon to make today. I lead no party; I follow no leader. I have given the best part of my life to careful study of Islam, its law and policy, its culture, its history and its literature. This constant contact with the spirit of Islam, as it unfolds itself in time, has, I think, given me a kind of insight into its significance as a world fact. It is in the light of this insight whatever its value, that, while assuming that the Muslims of India are determined to remain true to the spirit of Islam, I propose, not to guide you in your decisions but to attempt the humbler task of bringing clearly to your consciousness the main principle which, in my opinion, should determine the general character of these decisions.

It cannot be denied that Islam, regarded as an ethical ideal plus a certain kind of policy by which expression I mean a social structure regulated by a legal system and

animated by a specific ethical ideal—has been the chief formative factor in the life-history of the Muslims of India. It has furnished those basic emotions and loyalties, which gradually unify scattered individuals and groups, and finally transform them into a well-defined people, possessing a moral consciousness of their own. Indeed it is no exaggeration to say that India is perhaps the only country in the world where Islam...... as a society is almost entirely due to the working of Islam as a culture inspired by a specific ethical ideal. What I mean to say is that Muslim society, with its remarkable homogeneity and inner unity, has grown to be what it is, under the pressure of the laws and institutions associated with the culture of Islam......

......To address this session of the All-India Muslim League you have selected a man who is not despaired of Islam as a living force for freeing the outlook of man from its geographical limitations, who believes that religion is a power of the utmost importance in the life of individuals as well as States, and finally who believes that Islam is itself Destiny and will not suffer a destiny. Such a man cannot but look at matters from his own point of view. Do not think that the problem I am indicating is a purely theoretical one. It is a very living and practical problem calculated to affect the very fabric of Islam as a system of life and conduct. On a proper solution of it alone depends your future as a distinct cultural unit in India. Never in our history has Islam had to stand a greater trial than the one which confronts it today. It is open to a people to modify, reinterpret or reject the foundational principles of their social structure, but it is absolutely necessary for them to see clearly what they are doing before they undertake to try a fresh experiment. Nor should the way in which I am approaching this important problem lead anybody to think

that I intend to quarrel with those who happen to think differently. You are a Muslim assembly and, I suppose, anxious to remain true to the spirit and ideals of Islam. My sole desire, therefore, is to tell you frankly what I honestly believe to be the truth about the present situation. In this way alone it is possible for me to illuminate, according to my light, the avenues of your political action.

What, then, is the problem and its implications? Is religion a private affair? Would you like to see Islam, as a moral and political ideal, meeting the same fate in the world of Islam as Christianity has already met in Europe? Is it possible to retain Islam as an ethical ideal and to reject it as a polity in favour of national polities, in which religious attitude is not permitted to play any part? This question becomes of special importance in India where the Muslims happen to be in a minority. The proposition that religion is a private individual experience is not surprising on the lips of a European. In Europe the conception of Christianity as a monastic order, renouncing the world of matter and fixing its gaze entirely on the world of the spirit, led, by a logical process of thought, to the view embodied in this proposition. The nature of the Prophet's religious experience, as disclosed in the Quran, however, is wholly different. It is not mere experience in the sense of a purely biological event, happening inside the experiment and necessitating no reactions on its social environment. It is individual experience creative of a social order. Its immediate outcome is the fundamentals of a polity with implicit legal concepts whose civic significance cannot be belittled merely because their origin is revelational. The religious ideal of Islam, therefore, is organically related to the social order which it has created. The rejection of the one will eventually involve the rejection of the other.

Therefore the construction of a polity on national lines, if it means a displacement of the Islamic principle of solidarity, is simply unthinkable to a Muslim. This is a matter which at the present moment directly concerns the Muslims of India. "Man", says Renan, "is enslaved neither by his race, nor by his religion, nor by the course of rivers, nor by the direction of mountain ranges. A great aggregation of men, sane of mind and warm of heart, creates a moral consciousness which is called a nation." Such a formation is quite possible, though it involves the long and arduous process or practically re-making men and furnishing them with a fresh emotional equipment. It might have been a fact in India if the teaching of Kabir and the Divine Faith of Akbar had seized the imagination of the masses of this country. Experience, however, shows that the various caste units and religious units in India have shown no inclination to sink their respective individualities in a larger whole. Each group is intensely jealous of its collective existence. The formation of the kind of moral consciousness which constitutes the essence of a nation in Renan's sense demands a price which the peoples of India are not prepared to pay. The unity of an Indian nation, therefore, must be sought, not in the negation, but in the mutual harmony and co-operation of the many. True statesmanship cannot ignore facts, however unpleasant they may be. The only practical course is not to assume the existence of a state of things which does not exist, but to recognize facts as they are, and to exploit them to our greatest advantage. And it is on the discovery of Indian unity in this direction that the fate of India as well as Asia really depends. India is Asia in miniature. Part of her people have cultural affinities with nations in the east and part with nations in the middle and west of Asia. If an effective principle of co-operation is discovered in India, it will bring peace and mutual good-

will to this ancient land which has suffered so long, more because of her situation in historic space than because of any inherent incapacity of her people. And it will at the same time solve the entire political problem of Asia.

It is, however, painful to observe that our attempts to discover such a principle of internal harmony have so far failed. Why have they failed? Perhaps we suspect each other's intentions and inwardly aim at dominating each other. Perhaps in the higher interests of mutual co-operation we cannot afford to part with the monopolies which circumstances have placed in our hands, and conceal our egoism under the cloak of a nationalism, outwardly stimulating a large-hearted patriotism, but inwardly as narrow-minded as a caste or a tribe. Perhaps, we are unwilling to recognise that each group has a right to free development according to its own cultural traditions. But whatever may be the cause of our failure, I still feel hopeful. Events seem to be tending in the direction of some sort of internal harmony. And as far as I have been able to read the Muslim mind, I have no hesitation in declaring that, if the principle that the Indian Muslim is entitled to all and free development on the lines of his own culture—and tradition in his own Indian home-lands is recognised as the basis of a permanent communal settlement, he will be ready to stake his all for the freedom of India. The principle that each group is entitled to free development its own lines is not inspired by any feeling of narrow communalism. There are communalisms and communalisms. A community which is inspired by feelings of ill-will towards other communities is low and ignoble. I entertain the highest respect for the customs, laws, religious and social institutions of other communities. Nay, it is my duty, according to the teaching of the Quran, even to defend their

places of worship, if need be. Yet I love the communal group which is the source of my life and behaviour, and which has formed me what I am by giving me its religion, its literature, its thought, its culture and thereby realising its whole past as a living operative factor in my present consciousness. Even the authors of the Nehru Report recognise the value of this higher aspect of communalism. While discussing the separation of Sind they say: "To say from the larger viewpoint of nationalism that no communal provinces should be created, is in a way equivalent to saying from the still wider international view-point that there should be no separate nations. Both these statements have a measure of truth in them. But the staunchest internationalist recognises that without the fullest national autonomy it is extraordinarily difficult to create the international State. So also without the fullest cultural autonomy, and communalism in its better aspect is culture, it will be difficult to create a harmonious nation."

Communalism in its higher aspect, then, is indispensable to the formation of a harmonious whole in a country like India. The units of Indian society are not territorials as in European countries. India is a continent of human groups belonging to different races, speaking different languages and professing different religions. Their behaviour is not at all determined by a common race-consciousness. Even the Hindus do not form a homogeneous group. The principle of European democracy cannot be applied to India without recognising the fact of communal groups. The Muslim demand for the creation of a Muslim India within India is, therefore, perfectly justified. The resolution of the All-Parties Muslim Conference at Delhi, is, to my mind, wholly inspired by this noble ideal of a harmonious whole which, instead of

stifling the respective individualities of its component wholes, affords them chances of fully working out the possibilities that may be latent in them. And I have no doubt that this House will emphatically endorse the Muslim demands embodied in this resolution. Personally, I would go farther than the demands embodied in it. I would like to see the Punjab, North-west Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-government within the British Empire, or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim States appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India……

Nor should the Hindus fear that the creation of autonomous Muslim States will mean the introduction of a kind of religious rule in such States. I have already indicated to you the meaning of the word religion, as applied to Islam. The truth is that Islam is not a church. It is a State conceived as a contractual organism long before Rousseau ever thought of such a thing, and animated by an ethical ideal which regards man not as an earth-rooted creature, defined by this or that portion of the earth, but as a spiritual being understood in terms of a social mechanism, and possessing rights and duties as a living factor in that mechanism. The character of a Muslim State can be judged from what the "Times of India" pointed out sometime ago in a leader on the Indian Banking Enquiry Committee. "In ancient India", the paper points out, "the State framed laws regulating the rates of interest, but in Muslim times, although Islam clearly forbids the realization of interest on money loaned, Indian Muslim States imposed no restrictions on such rates." I therefore demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim State in the best interests of India and Islam. For India it means of security

and peace resulting from an internal balance of power; for Islam an opportunity to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilise its law, its education, its culture, and to bring them into closer contact with its own original spirit and with the spirit of modern times......

I have thus tried briefly to indicate the way in which the Muslims of India ought, in my opinion, to look at the two most important constitutional problems of India. A redistribution of British India, calculated to secure a permanent solution of the communal problem, is the main demand of the Muslim of India. If, however, the Muslim demand of a territorial solution of the communal problem is ignored, then I support, as emphatically as possible, the Muslim demands repeatedly urged by the All-India Muslim League and All Indian Muslim Conference. The Muslims of India cannot agree to any constitutional changes which affect their majority rights, to be secured by separate electorates in the Punjab and Bengal, or fail to guarantee them 33 per cent representation in any Central Legislature. There were two pitfalls into which Muslim political leaders fell. The first was the repudiated Lucknow Pact which originated in a false view of Indian nationalism and deprived the Muslims of India of chances of acquiring any political power in India. The second is the narrow - versioned sacrifice of Islamic solidarity, in the interests of what may be called Punjab ruralism resulting in a proposal which virtually reduces the Punjab Muslims to a position of minority. It is the duty of the League to condemn both the Pact and the proposal......

......I think I am now called upon to make a few observations on the Round Table Conference. Personally I

do not feel optimistic as to the results of this Conference. It was hoped that away from the actual scene of communal strife and in a changed atmosphere, better counsels would prevail and a genuine settlement of the differences between the two major communities of India would bring India's freedom within sight. Actual events, however, tell a different tale. Indeed, the discussion of the communal question in London has demonstrated more clearly than ever the essential disparity between the two great cultural units of India. Yet the Prime Minister of England apparently refuses to see that the problem of India is international and not national. He is reported to have said that "this Government would find it difficult to submit to Parliament proposals for the maintenance of separate electorates, since joint electorates were much more in accordance with British democratic sentiments". Obviously, he does not see that the model of British democracy cannot be of any use in a land of many nations; and that a system of separate electorates is only a poor substitute for a territorial solution of the problem. Nor is the Minorities Sub-Committee likely to reach a satisfactory settlement. The whole question will have to go before the British Parliament; and we can only hope that the keen-sighted representatives of British nation, unlike most of our Indian politicians, will be able to pierce through the surface of things and see clearly the true fundamentals of peace and security in a country like India. To base a constitution on the concept of a homogeneous India or to apply to India principles dictated by British democratic sentiments is unwittingly to prepare her for a civil war. As far as I can see, there will be no peace in the country until the various peoples that constitute India are given opportunities of free self-development on modern lines without abruptly breaking with their past.

I am glad to be able to say that our Muslim delegates fully realised the importance of a proper solution of what I call Indian international problem. They are perfectly justified in pressing for a solution of the communal question before the question of responsibility in the Central government is finally settled. No Muslim politician should be sensitive to the taunt embodied in that propaganda word—communalism—expressly devised to exploit what the Prime Minister calls British democratic sentiments, and to mislead England into assuming a state of things which does not really exist in India. Great interests are at stake. We are 70 millions and far more homogeneous than any other people in India. Indeed the Muslims of India are the only Indian people who can fitly be described as a nation in the modern sense of the word. The Hindus, though ahead of us in almost all respects, have not yet been able to achieve the kind of homogeneity which is necessary for a nation, and which Islam has given you as a free gift. No doubt they are anxious to become a nation, but the process of becoming a nation is a kind of travail, and in the case of Hindu India, involves a complete overhauling of her social structure. Nor should the Muslim leaders and politicians allow themselves to be carried away by the subtle but fallacious arguments that Turkey and Persia and other Muslim countries are progressing on national, i.e., territorial lines. The Muslims of India are differently situated. The countries of Islam outside India are practically wholly Muslim in population. The minorities there belong, in the language of the Quran, to the "people of the Book". There are no social barriers between Muslims and the "people of the Book". A Jew or a Christian or a Zoroastrian does not pollute the food of a Muslim by touching it, and the law of Islam allows intermarriage with

the "people of the Book". Indeed the first practical step that Islam took towards the realisation of a final combination of humanity was to call upon peoples possessing practically the same ethical ideal to come forward and combine. The Quran declares: "O people of the Book! Come, let us join together on the 'word' (Unity of God), that is common to us all." The wars of Islam and Christianity, and later, European aggression in its various forms, could not allow the infinite meaning of this verse to work itself out in the world of Islam. Today it is being gradually realised in the countries of Islam in the shape of what is called Muslim Nationalism.

It is hardly necessary for me to add that the sole test of the success of our delegates is the extent to which they are able to get the non-Muslim delegates of the Conference to agree to our demands as embodied in the Delhi Resolution. If these demands are not agreed to, then a question of a very great and far-reaching importance will arise for the community. Then will arrive the moment for an independent and concerted political action by the Muslims of India. If you are at all serious about your ideals and aspirations, you must be ready for such an action. Our leading men have done a good deal of political thinking, and their thought has certainly made us, more or less, sensitive to the forces which are now shaping the destinies of peoples in India and outside India. But I ask, has this thinking prepared us for the kind of action demanded by the situation which may arise in the near future? Let me tell you frankly that, at the present moment, the Muslims of India are suffering from two evils. The first is the want of personalities. Sir Malcolm Hailey and Lord Irwin were perfectly correct in their diagnosis when they told the Aligarh University that the community had failed to

produce leaders. By leaders I mean men who, by divine gift or experience, possess a keen perception of the spirit and destiny of Islam, along with an equally keen perception of the trend of modern history. Such men are really the driving forces of a people, but they are God's gift and cannot be made to order. The second evil from which the Muslims of India are suffering is that the community is fast losing what is called the herd instinct. This makes it possible for individuals and groups to start independent careers without contributing to the general thought and activity of the community. We are doing today in the domain of politics what we have been doing for centuries in the domain of religion. But sectional bickerings in religion do not do much harm to our solidarity. They at least indicate an interest in what makes the sole principle of our structure as a people. Moreover, the principle is so broadly conceived that it is almost impossible for a group to become rebellious to the extent of wholly detaching itself from the general body of Islam. But diversity in political action, at a moment when concerted action is needed in the best interests of the very life of our people, may prove fatal. How shall we, then, remedy these two evils? The remedy of the first evil is not in our hands. As to the second evil, I think it is possible to discover a remedy. I have got definite views on the subject; but I think it is proper to postpone their expression till the apprehended situation actually arises. In case it does arise, leading Muslims of all shades of opinion will have to meet together, not to pass resolutions, but finally to determine the Muslim attitude and to show the path to tangible achievement. In this address I mention this alternative only because I wish that you may keep it in mind and give some serious thought to it in the meantime.

Gentlemen, I have finished. In conclusion I cannot but impress upon you that the present crisis in the history of India demands complete organization and unity of will and purpose in the Muslim community, both in your own interest as a community, and in the interest of India as a whole. The political bondage of India has been and is a source of infinite misery to the whole of Asia. It has suppressed the spirit of the East and wholly deprived her of that joy of self-expression which once made her the creator of a great and glorious culture. We have a duty towards India where we are destined to live and die. We have a duty towards Asia, especially Muslim Asia. And since 70 millions of Muslims in a single country constitute a far more valuable asset to Islam than all the countries of Muslim Asia put together, we must look at the Indian problem not only from the Muslim point of view but also from the standpoint of the Indian Muslim as such. Our duty towards Asia and India cannot be loyally performed without an organised will fixed on a definite purpose. In your own interest, as political entity among other political entities of India, such an equipment is an absolute necessity. Our disorganised condition has already confused political issues vital to the life of the community. I am not hopeless of an intercommunal understanding, but I cannot conceal from you the feeling that in the near future our community may be called upon to adopt an independent line of action to cope with the present crisis. And an independent line of political action, in such a crisis, is possible only to determined people, possessing a will focalised by a single purpose. Is it possible for you to achieve the organic wholeness of a unified will? Yes, it is. Rise above sectional interests and private ambitions, and learn to determine the value of your individual and collective action, however directed on material ends, in the

light of the ideal, which you are supposed to represent, Pass from matter to spirit. Matter is diversity; spirit is light, life and unity. One lesson I have learnt from the history of Muslims. At critical moments in their history it is Islam that has saved Muslims and not vice versa. If today you focus your vision of Islam and seek inspiration from the ever-vitalising idea embodied in it, you will be only reassembling your scattered forces, regaining your lost integrity, and thereby saving yourself from total destruction. One of the profoundest verses in the Holy Quran teaches us that the birth and rebirth of the whole of humanity is like the birth and rebirth of a single individual. Why cannot you who, as a people, can well claim to be the first practical exponents of this superb conception of humanity, live and move and have your being as a single individual? I do not wish to mystify anybody when I say that things in India are not what they appear to be. The meaning of this, however, will dawn upon you only when you have achieved a real collective ego to look at them. In the words of the Quran, "Hold fast to yourself; no one who erreth can hurt you, provided you are well guided". (5:104)

---

* *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal,* (Vahid, S. A. Edit.), Iqbal's Allahabad Address, Delivered at the Annual Session of the All-India Muslim League, on the 29th December 1930, pp.161-194.

# Iqbal's Lahore Address*
## (Extracts)

……In the present address I propose, among other things, to help you, in the first place, in arriving at a correct view of the situation as it emerged from a rather hesitating behaviour of our delegation at the final stages of the Round Table Conference. In the second place, I shall try, according to my lights, to show how far it is desirable to construct a fresh policy now that the Premier's announcement at the last London Conference has again necessitated a careful survey of the whole situation……

The next question is to explore the possibilities of shaping, if necessary, a new policy after the disappointing announcement made by the British Premier at the close of the last London Conference. Muslims have naturally grown apprehensive of Government's attitude towards the problem of communal settlement. They suspect that the Government will purchase Congress co-operation at any cost, and that its delay in conceding Muslim demands is only a cover for the possibility of finding some basis for negotiations with that body. The policy of trusting the Government in regard to political issues seems to be rapidly losing its hold on the mind of the community……

……The British Government's present attitude, however, would show that they do not mean to function as an impartial holder of balance in India, and are indirectly

driving the Indian communities, which are mainly Hindus and Muslims, to a kind of civil war. We tried the majority community and found them unwilling to recognise the safeguards which we can forego at the risk of complete extinction as a nation determined to live its own life. The alternative was to hope for justice from the British who, ever since they took the country from the Muslims, have claimed, as I have said above, to function as an impartial holder of balance in India. In their case, too, we find that the old British courage and straight-forwardness are replaced by a constantly shifting policy which can inspire no confidence and seems to be calculated only to facilitate their own position in India. The Muslim community is thus brought to face the question whether it is in their interests of the community that their present policy which has so far obviated British difficulties and brought no gain to the community shall continue for any further period of time. This is a question for the open Conference to decide. All that I can say at the present stage is that, if you decide to discontinue this policy, your immediate duty is to prepare the whole community for the kind of self-sacrifice without which no self-respecting people can live an honourable life. The most critical moment in the history of the Indian Muslims has arrived: Do your duty or cease to exist......

It is obvious, therefore, that the attitude of the British Government towards our demands and the gravity of the situation in the Frontier Province and Kashmir claim our immediate attention. But what claims our immediate attention is not our only concern. We must have a clear perception of the forces which are silently moulding the future, and place a relatively permanent programme of

work before the community in view of the probable direction of events in the country. The present struggle in India is sometimes described as India's revolt against the West. I do not think it is a revolt against the West; for the people of India are demanding the very institutions, which the West stands for. Whether the gamble of elections, retinues of party leaders and hollow pageants of parliaments will suit a country of peasants to whom the money-economy of modern democracy is absolutely incomprehensible, is a different question altogether. Educated urban India demands democracy. The minorities, feeling themselves as distinct cultural units and fearing that their very existence is at stake, demand safeguards, which the majority community, for obvious reasons, refuses to concede. The majority community pretends to believe in a nationalism, theoretically correct, if we start from Western premises, belied by facts, if we look to India. Thus the real parties to the present struggle in India are not England and India, but the majority community and the minorities of India which can ill-afford to accept the principle of Western democracy until it is properly modified to suit the actual conditions of life in India.

Nor do Mahatma Gandhi's political methods signify a revolt in the psychological sense. These methods arise out of a contact of two opposing types of world-consciousness, Western and Eastern. The Western man's mental texture is chronological in character. He lives and moves and has his being in time. The Eastern man's world-consciousness is non-historical. To the Western man things gradually become; they have a past, present and future. To the Eastern man they are immediately rounded off, timeless,

purly present. That is why Islam which sees in the time movement a symbol of reality appeared as an intruder in the static world pictures of Asia. The British as a Western people cannot but conceive political reform in India as a systematic process of gradual evolution. Mahatma Gandhi as an Eastern man sees in this attitude nothing more than an ill-conceived unwillingness to part with power and tries all sorts of destructive negations to achieve immediate attainment. Both are elementally incapable of understanding each other. The result is the appearance of a revolt.

These phenomena, however, are merely premonitions of a coming storm, which is likely to sweep over the whole of India and the rest of Asia. This is the inevitable outcome of a wholly political civilisation which has looked upon man as a thing to be exploited and not as a personality to be developed and enlarged by purely cultural forces. The peoples of Asia are bound to rise against the acquisitive economy which the West has developed and imposed on the nations of the East. Asia cannot comprehend modern Western capitalism with its undisciplined individualism. The faith which you represent recognises the worth of the individual, and disciplines him to give away his all to the service of God and man. Its possibilities are not yet exhausted. It can still create a new world where the social rank of man is not determined by his caste or colour, or the amount of dividend he earns, but by the kind of life he lives; where the poor tax the rich, where human society is founded not on the equality of stomachs but on the equality of spirits, where an Untouchable can marry the daughter of a king, where private ownership is a trust and where capital

cannot be allowed to accumulate so as to dominate the real producer of wealth. This superb idealism of your faith, however, needs emancipation from the medieval fancies of theologians and legists. Spiritually we are living in a prison house of thoughts and emotions which during the course of centuries we have woven round ourselves. And be it further said to the shame of us—men of older generation—that we have failed to equip the younger generation for the economic, political and even religious crises that the present age is likely to bring. The whole community needs a complete overhauling of its present mentality in order that it may again become capable of feeling the urge of fresh desires and ideals. The Indian Muslim has long ceased to explore the depths of his own inner life. The result is that he has ceased to live in the full glow and colour of life, and is consequently in danger of an unmanly compromise with forces which, he is made to think, he cannot vanquish in open conflict. He who desires to change an unfavourable environment must undergo a complete transformation of his inner being. God changeth not the condition of a people until they themselves take the initiative to change their condition by constantly illuminating the zone of their daily activity in the light of definite ideal. Nothing can be achieved without a firm faith in the independence of one's own inner life. This faith alone keeps a people's eye fixed on their goal and saves them from perpetual vacillation. The lesson that past experience has brought to you must be taken to heart. Expect nothing from any side. Concentrate your whole ego on yourself alone, and ripen your clay into real manhood if you wish to see your aspirations realised. Mussolini's maxim was: "He who has steel has everything." Be hard and work hard. This is the whole secret of individual and collective life. Our ideal is well

defined. It is to win in the coming constitution a position for Islam which may bring her opportunities to fulfill her destiny in this country. It is necessary in the light of this ideal to rouse the progressive forces of the community and to organise their hitherto dormant energies. The flame of life cannot be borrowed from others; it must be kindled in the temple of one's own soul.

---

* *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal,* (Vahid, S. A. Edit.), Iqbal's Address, Delivered at the Annual Session of the All-India Muslim Conference at Lahore on the 21st March 1932, pp.195-219.

# 3

## Iqbal's Letter to Jinnah*

Confidential

Lahore
28th May, 1937

My dear Mr. Jinnah

Thank you so much for your letter which reached me in the course. I am glad to hear that you will bear in mind what I wrote to you about the changes in the constitution and programme of the League. I have no doubt that you fully realise the gravity of the situation as far as Muslim India is concerned. The League will have to finally decide whether it will remain a body representing the upper classes of Indian Muslims or Muslim masses that have so far, with good reason, taken no interest in it. Personally I believe that political organisation which gives no promise of improving the lot of the average Muslim cannot attract our masses.

Under the new constitution the higher posts go to the sons of upper classes; the smaller ones go to the friends or relatives of the ministers. In other matters, too, our political institutions have never thought of improving the lot of Muslims generally. The problem of bread is becoming more and more acute. The Muslim has begun to feel that he has been going down and down during the last 200 years. Ordinarily he believes that his poverty is due to Hindu

money - lending or capitalism. The perception that it is equally due to foreign rule has not yet fully come to him.

The atheistic socialism of Jawaharlal is not likely to receive much response from the Muslims. The question therefore is: how is it possible to solve the problem of Muslim poverty? And the whole future of the League depends of the League's activity to solve this question. If the League can give no such promises I am sure the Muslim masses will remain indifferent to it as before.

Happily there is a solution in the enforcement of the Laws of Islam and its further development in the light of modern ideas. After a long and careful study of Islamic Law I have come to the conclusion that if this system of Law is properly understood and applied, at last the right to subsistence is secured to everybody. But the enforcement and development of the *Shariat* of Islam is impossible in this country without a free Muslim state or states. This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India. If such a thing is impossible in India the only other alternative is a civil war which as a matter of fact has been going on for some time in the shape of Hindu-Muslim riots. I fear that in certain parts of the country, e.g. N.W. India, Palestine may be repeated.

Also the insertion of Jawaharlal's socialism into the body-politic of Hinduism is likely to cause much bloodshed among the Hindus themselves. The issue between social democracy and Brahmanism is not dissimilar to the one between Brahmanism and Buddhism. Whether the fate of socialism will be the same as the fate of Buddhism in India

I cannot say. But it is clear to my mind that if Hinduism accepts social democracy it must necessarily cease to be Hinduism. For Islam the acceptance of social democracy in some suitable form and consistent with the legal principles of Islam is not a revolution but a return to the original purity of Islam. The modern problems therefore are far more easy to solve for the Muslims than for the Hindus.

But as I have said above in order to make it possible for Muslim India to solve the problems it is necessary to redistribute the country and to provide one or more Muslim states with absolute majorities. Don't you think that the time for such a demand has already arrived? Perhaps this is the best reply you can give to the atheistic socialism of Jawaharlal Nehru.

Anyhow I have given you my own thoughts in the hope that you will give them serious consideration either in your address or in the discussions of the coming session of the League. Muslim India hopes that at this serious juncture your genius will discover some way out of our present difficulties.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) Muhammad Iqbal

P.S. On the subject-matter of this letter I intended to write to you a long and open letter in the press. But on further consideration I felt that the present moment was not suitable for such a step.

---

**Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*, Lahore (Sh. Ashraf), 1943, pp.3-7.

# 4

## *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*: Foreword*

By

Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah

The letters which form the subject of this booklet were written to me by the sage, philosopher and national poet of Islam, the late Dr. Sir Muhammad Iqbal, during the period May 1936 to November 1937, a few months before his death. This period synchronizes with a very eventful period in the history of Muslim India—between the establishment of the All-India Muslim League Central Parliamentary Board in June 1936 and the great historic sessions at Lucknow in October 1937.

If the Central Parliamentary Board with its Provincial Branches marked the first great attempt on the part of the Muslim League to rally round the Muslim opinion to contest the approaching elections, under the Government of India Act of 1935, for Provincial Legislatures on the League ticket, the Lucknow Session indicated the first stage in the reorganization of the Muslim League on a popular basis and as the only authoritative and representative organisation of Muslim India. Both these high objects were attained in great part owing to the invaluable support that I obtained through the sincere efforts and patriotic and selfless activities of many friends like Sir Muhammad Iqbal, amongst others. The League

gained from strength to strength in this short period. In each of the Provinces where the League Parliamentary Board was established and the League parties were constituted we carried away about 60 to 70 per cent of the seats that were contested by the League candidates. Hundreds of District and Primary Leagues were established in almost every Province from the farthest corner of Madras to the North-West Frontier Province.

The League gave a staggering blow to the so-called Muslim Mass Contact Movement which we started by the Congress to disrupt Muslim ranks and to overawe the League into submission. The League emerged triumphant in most of the by-elections and shattered the intrigues and machinations of those who hoped to create the impression that the Muslim League Organisation had no support of the Muslim people.

Within eighteen months before the Lucknow Session [October, 1937}, the League had succeeded in organizing Muslims as one party with an advanced and progressive programme and had brought under its influence even those Provinces which for lack of time or preparation had not been sufficiently benefited by the activities of League Parliamentary Boards. The Lucknow Session furnished an unmistakable evidence of the popularity that League commanded among Muslims of all groups and ranks.

It was a great achievement for the Muslim League that its lead came to be acknowledged by both the majority and minority Provinces. Sir Muhammad Iqbal played a very conspicuous part, though at the time not revealed to public, in bringing about this consummation. He had his own doubts about Sikandar-Jinnah Pact being carried out

and he was anxious to see it translated into some tangible results without delay so as to dispel popular misapprehension about it, but unfortunately he has not lived to see that the Punjab has all round made a remarkable progress and now it is beyond doubt that the Muslims stand solidly behind the Muslim League Organisation.

With this brief historical background in mind, the letters can be read with great interest. It is, however, much to be regretted that my own replies to Iqbal are not available. During the period under reference I worked alone unassisted by the benefit of a personal staff and so did not retain duplicate copies of the numerous letters that I had to dispose of. I made enquiries from the Trustees of Iqbal's estate at Lahore and was informed that my letters are not traceable. Hence I had no alternative but to publish the letters without my replies as I think these letters are of very great historical importance, particularly those which explain his views in clear and unambiguous terms on the political future of Muslim India. His views were substantially in consonance with my own and had finally led me to the same conclusions as a result of careful examination and study of the constitutional problems facing India, and found expression in due course in the united will of Muslim India as adumbrated in the Lahore resolution of the All-India Muslim League, popularly known as the "Pakistan Resolution", passed on 23rd March, 1940.

M. A. Jinnah
27th March, 1943.

**Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*, op. cit., pp 3-7.

# 5

## NOW OR NEVER*

### Are We to Live or Perish for Ever?

By

**MOHD. ASLAM KHAN,**
**(Khattak)**
**President, Khyber Union**

**RAHMAT ALI,**
**(Choudhary)**

**SHEIKH MOHD SADIQ,**
**(Sahibzada)**

**INAYAT ULLAH KHAN**
**(of Charsaddah).**
**Secretary, Khyber Union.**

At this solemn hour in the history of India, when British and Indian statesmen are laying the foundations of a Federal Constitution for that land, we address this appeal to you, in the name of our common heritage, on behalf of our thirty million Muslim brethren who live in PAKISTAN—by which we mean the five Northern units of India. Viz. Punjab, North-West Frontier Province (Afghan Province), Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan—for your sympathy and support in our grim and fateful struggle against political crucifixion and complete annihilation.

Our brave but voiceless nation is being sacrificed on the altar of Hindu Nationalism not only by the non-Muslims, but to the lasting disgrace of Islam, by our own

so-called leaders, with reckless disregard to our future and in utter contempt of the teachings of history.

The Indian Muslim Delegation at the Round Table Conference have committed an inexcusable and prodigious blunder. They have submitted, in the name of Hindu Nationalism, to the perpetual subjection of the ill-starred Muslim nation. These leaders have already agreed, without any protest or demur and without any reservation, to a Consttution based on the principle of an All-India Federation. This, in essence, amounts to nothing less than signing the death-warrant of Islam and its future in India. In doing so, they have taken shelter behind the so-called Mandate from the community. But they forgot that that suicidal Mandate was framed and formulated by their own hands. That Mandate was not the Mandate of the Muslims of India. Nations never give Mandates to their representatives to barter away their very souls; and men of conscience never accept such self-annihilating Mandates, if given—much less execute them. At a time of a crisis of this magnitude, the foremost duty of saving statesmanship is to give a fair, firm and fearless lead, which, alas, has been persistently denied to eighty millions of our co-religionists in India by our leaders during the last seventy-five years. These have been the years of false issues, of lost opportunities and of utter blindness to the most essential and urgent needs of the Muslim interests. Their policy has throughout been nerveless in action and subservient in attitude. They have all along been paralysed with fear and doubt, and have deliberately, time and again, sacrificed their political principles for the sake of opportunism and expediency. To do so even at this momentous juncture is a policy of Bedlam. It is idle for us not to look this tragic

truth in the face. The tighter we shut our eyes, the harder that truth will hit us.

At this critical moment, when this tragedy is being enacted, permit us to appeal to you for your practical sympathy and active support for the demand of a separate Federation—a matter of life and death for the Muslims of India—as outlined and explained below.

India, constituted as it is at the present moment, is not the name of one single country; nor the home of one single nation. It is, in fact, the designation of a State created for the first time in history, by the British. It includes peoples who have never previously formed part of India at any period of its history; but who have, on the other hand, from the dawn of history till the advent of the British, possessed and retained distinct nationalities of their own.

In the five Northern Provinces of India, out of a total population of about forty millions, we, the Muslims, constitute about thirty millions. Our religion, culture, history, tradition, economic system, laws of inheritance, succession and marriage are basically and fundamentally different from those of the people living in the rest of India. The ideals which move our thirty million brethren-in-faith living in these Provinces to make the highest sacrifices are fundamentally different from those which inspire the Hindus. These differences are not confined to the broad basic principles—far from it. They extend to the minutest details of our lives. We do not inter-dine; we do not inter-marry. Our national customs and calendars, even our diet and dress are different.

It is preposterous to compare, as some superficial observers do, the differences between Muslims and Hindus with those between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Both the Catholics and Protestants are part and parcel of one religious system—Christianity; while the Hindus and Muslims are the followers of two essentially and fundamentally different religious systems. Religion in the case of Muslims and Hindus is not a matter of private opinion as it is in the case of Christians; but on the other hand constitutes a Civic Church which lays down a code of conduct to be observed by their adherents from birth to death.

If we, the Muslims of Pakistan, with our distinct marks of nationality, are deluded into the proposed Indian Federation, by friends or foes, we are reduced to a minority of one to four. It is this which sounds the death-knell of the Muslim nation in India forever. To realise the full magnitude of this impending catastrophe, let us remind you that we thirty millions constitute about one-tenth of the whole Muslim world. The total area of the five units comprising PAKSTAN, which are our homelands, is four times that of Italy, three times that of Germany and twice that of France; and our population seven times that of the Dominion of Canada, twice that of Spain, and equal to France and Italy considered individually.

These are facts—hard facts and realities—which we challenge anybody to contradict. It is on the basis of these facts that we make bold to assert without the least fear of contradiction that we, Muslims of PAKSTAN, do possess a separate and distinct nationality from the rest of India, where the Hindu nation lives and has every right to live. We, therefore, deserve and must demand the recognition of

a separate national status by the grant of a separate Federal Constitution from the rest of India.

In addressing this appeal to the Muslims of India, we are also addressing it to the two other great interests—British and Hindu—involved in the settlement of India's future. They must understand that in our conviction our body and soul are at stake. Our very being and well-being depends upon it. For our five great Northern states to join an All-India Federation would be disastrous, not only to ourselves, but to every other race and interest in India, including the British and the Hindu.

This is more especially true when there is a just and reasonable alternative to the proposed settlement, which will lay the foundations of a peaceful future for this great sub-continent; and should certainly allow of the highest development of each of these two peoples without one being subject to another. This alternative is a separate Federation of these five predominantly Muslim units-Punjab, North-West Frontier Province (Afghan Province), Kashmir, Sind and Baluchistan. The Muslim Federation of North-West India would provide the bulwark of a buffer state against any invasion either of ideas or of arms from outside. The creation of such a federation would not materially disturb the ratio of the Muslim and Hindu population in the rest of India. It is wholly to the interest of British and Hindu statesmanship to have as an ally a free, powerful and contented Muslim nation having a similar but separate Constitution to that which is being enacted for the rest of India. Nothing but a separate Federation of our homelands would satisfy us. This demand is basically different from the suggestion put forward by Dr. Sir Mohammad Iqbal in his Presidential address to the All-India Muslim League in 1930. While he proposed the

amalgamation of these Provinces into a single state forming a unit of the All-India Federation, we propose that these provinces should have a separate Federation of their own. There can be no peace and tranquillity in the land if we, the Muslims, are duped into a Hindu-dominated Federation where we cannot be the masters of our own destiny and captains of our own souls.

Do the safeguards provided for in the Constitution give us any scope to work for our salvation along our own lines? Not a bit. Safeguard is the magic word which holds our leaders spellbound, and has dulled their consciences. In the ecstasy of their hallucinations they think that the pills of safeguards can cure nation-annihilating earthquakes. Safeguards asked for by these leaders and agreed to by the makers of the Constitution can never be a substitute for the loss of separate nationality. We, the Muslims, shall have to fight that course of suicidal insanity to death. What safeguards can be devised to prevent our minority of one in four in an All-India Federation from being sacrificed on every vital issue to the aims and interests of the majority race, which differs from us in every essential of individual and corporate life? What safeguards can prevent the catastrophe of the Muslim nation smarting and suffering eternally at the frustration of its every social and religious ideal? What safeguards can compensate our nation awakened to its national consciousness for the destruction of its distinct national status? However effective and extensive the safeguards may be, the vital organs and proud symbols of our national life, such as army and navy, foreign relations, trade and commerce, communications, posts and telegraphs, taxation and customs, will not be under our control, but will be in the hands of a Federal Government, which is bound to be overwhelmingly Hindu. With all this, how can we, the Muslims, achieve any of our

ideals if those ideals conflict—as they must—with the ideals of Hindus?

The history of the last century, in this respect, is full of unforgettable lessons for us. To take just one instance Despite all these safeguards and guarantees we have enjoyed in the past, the very name of our national language-URDU, even now the lingua franca of that great sub-continent—has been wiped out of the list of Indian languages. We have just to open the latest census report to verify it. This by itself is a tragic fall. Are we fated to fall farther? But that, too, is dust in the scales by comparison with the tremendous national issues involving our whole future as a nation and a power not only in India, but also in the whole of Asia.

In the face of these incontrovertible facts, we are entitled to ask for what purpose are we being asked to make the supreme sacrifice of surrendering our nationality and submitting ourselves and our posterity to Non-Muslim domination? What good is likely to accrue to Islam and Muslims by going into the Federation is a thing, which passes our understanding. Are we to be crucified just to save the faces of our leaders, or to bolster up the preposterous falsehood that India can be a single nation? Is it with a view to achieve [*sic.*] a compromise at all costs, or is it to support the illusion that Hindu nationalism is working in the interests of Muslims as well as Hindus? Irony is flattered to death by a mental muddle of such a nature and on such a scale. We have suffered in the past without a murmur and faced dangers without demur. The one thing we would never suffer is our own self-strangulation. We will not crucify ourselves upon the cross of Hindu nationalism in order to make a Hindu-holiday.

May we be permitted to ask of all those statesmen—Muslim or British or Hindu—supporting the Federal Constitution, if it is really desirable to make our nation sacrifice all that Islam has given us during the last fourteen hundred years to make India a nation? Does humanity really stand to gain by this stupendous sacrifice? We dare say that still in Islam the ancient fire glows and promises much for the future, if only the leaders would let it live. Whilst in Europe, excluding Russia, in about the same area as that of India and with about the same population, there live and prosper as many as twenty-six nations, with one and the same religion, civilization and economic system, surely it is not only possible but highly desirable for two fundamentally different and distinct nations, i.e., Muslim and Hindu, to live as friendly neighbours in peace and prosperity in this vast sub-continent. What bitter irony is it that our leaders have not the courage to stand up and demand the minimum for our political salvation.?

We are face to face with a first-rate tragedy, the like of which has not been seen even in the long and eventful history of Islam. It is not the question of a sect or of a community going down; but it is the supreme problem which affects the destiny of the whole of Islam and the millions of human beings who, till quite recently, were the custodians of the glory of Islam in India and the defenders of its frontiers. We have a still greater future before us, if only our soul can be saved from the perpetual bondage of slavery forged in an All-India Federation. Let us make no mistake about it. The issue is now or never. Either we live or perish for ever. The future is ours only if we live up to our faith. It does not lie in the lap of the gods, but it rests in our own hands. We can make or mar it. The history of the

last century is full of open warnings, and they are as plain as were ever given to any nation. Shall it be said of us that we ignored all these warnings and allowed our ancient heritage to perish in our own hands?

---

* *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali*, Vol. I, Edited by K.K. Aziz, Islamabad., 1978, pp.1-10

# 6

# THE GREATEST BETRAYAL*
## How to Redeem the *Millat*?

By

Rahmat Ali

It is a tragedy that the British Plan of the 2nd June, 1947, has been accepted today by Mr. Jinnah and, on his advice, by his All-India Muslim League. By the acceptance of the plan he has betrayed, bartered, and dismembered the whole *Millat*. Not as it was betrayed by Miss Janki in 712, for hers was an act of betrayal affecting only Marshal Muhammad Qasim and Pakistan. Not as it was bartered by Mir Jaafar in 1757, for his was an act of barter involving only Siraj-ul-Daulah and *Bangistan*. Not as it was dismembered by most of the *Jalalatmaabs* in 1857, for theirs was an act of dismemberment affecting only some of its sections and strongholds. But it has now been completely betrayed, bartered, and dismembered by Mr. Jinnah, whose act of accepting the British Plan shatters the foundations of all its nations and countries and sabotages the future of all its 100 million members living in the Continent of *Dinia* and its Dependencies.

In view of this, it is the sacred duty of every Muslim in the Continent to grasp the significance of this acceptance and to counteract it in the consciousness that, unless

nullified, it will forever cripple the life of the Pak Nation, blight the existence of the *Millat* in *Dinia*, and compromise the freedom of the Fraternity throughout the world.

### The Tragic Effects of the Betrayal

That all this is inevitable is clear from the following immediate consequences of his act—consequences whose ultimate import cannot yet be fully computed:-

First, for the first time in the *Millat's* history in *Dinia*, he has destroyed its thirteen-century-old unity—a unity which it cherished as the source of its rise and expansion in the Continent; which it promoted to maintain its integrity throughout the era of its power; which it has preserved, even during the period of its subjection to Britain, to foster its revival and regeneration; and which it now deems more vital than ever to achieve the security and sovereignty of all its nations in *Dinia* and its Dependencies. It is obvious that, in destroying this unity, he has destroyed an asset that is universally accepted by all great communities as essential to their progress in the world. In fact, to recover this asset, the Christians in Europe and America are employing their best brains and spending their fabulous wealth; to secure it, the Communists throughout the world are dedicating all the fervour of their faith; and, to safeguard it, the Caste Hindus in *Dinia* have, in spite of all difficulties and disadvantages, ever devoted their entire resources.

Secondly, for the first time in the *Millat*'s history in *Dinia*, he has accepted from the *British-Bania Alliance* the dubious recognition of two of its ten nations on the fatal conditions:-

(a) That one of these two nations—Pakistan—shall forfeit half of the Punjab, half of the historical Sindh (Palanpur, Kachch, Kathiawar, and Kambay), the whole of Kashmir, the Delhi Division, and the cis-Jamna territories:

(b) That the other—*Bangistan*—shall lose half of Bengal and the whole of Assam, minus the district of Sylhet;

(c) That both—the paralysed Pakistan and the battered *Bangistan*—shall be the slaves of Britain; that, like all slaves, they shall take an oath of allegiance to their master—the King of Britain; and that, if rumours are true, they shall remain indifferent-in action-towards the fate of Palestine, but active in support of Britain against her rivals in the world;

(d) That the *Millat*'s other nations in *Dinia*, including the nations of the founders of the empires of Delhi and of the kingdoms of Oudh and Khandes, of Bijapur and Maisour, shall all be the eternal serfs of the Caste Hindus; that they shall for ever renounce their own nationhoods, embrace Hindus nationality, and swear an oath of allegiance to the Head of the Caste Hindu State in *Dinia*.

Thirdly, for the first time in the *Millat*'s history in *Dinia*, he has surrendered to the Caste Hindus:

(a) Almost all its strategic places and historic battlefields including Panipat and Fatihpur Sikri, which are the shrines of its chivalry, the scenes of its victories, and the shields of its defence; and

(b) Almost all its famous cities, including Delhi, Agrah, and Lucknow, Aligarh, Ahmadabad and Bijapur, which contain most of its great mosques and seats of learning; the palaces, monuments, and mausoleums of its Padshahs; and the *mazars* of its saints, *mujahids*, and savants.

Fourthly, for the first time in the *Millat*'s history in *Dinia*, he has renounced in effect its Mission in *Dinia* and in fact its pan-Islamic creed* in the world—that Mission which is the supreme purpose of its life, and that creed which is the eternal basis of the integrity of the Fraternity.

Lastly, for the first time in the *Millat*'s history in *Dinia*, he has, as an inevitable result of all this, wiped out the achievement of 1308 out of the 1309 years of its existence, and delivered to the *British-Bania Alliance* all that its saints, sovereigns, and soldiers had won or built for it in *Dinia* since 638 A.D.

These are a few—only a few—of the dire consequences of the act of Mr. Jinnah—consequences which will grow worse with time and overwhelm ourselves and our posterity.

**Attempts to whitewash the Betrayal**

To escape the verdict of History attempts are being made by Mr. Jinnah to whitewash the betrayal. But such attempts are doomed to failure. For his crime is too black to be whitewashed, and its consequences for the *Millat* are too calamitous to be ignored by history.

It has been stated by Mr. Jinnah that his acceptance of the British Plan is a compromise—not a settlement. That statement is a complete misrepresentation. This for two reasons. First, morally and legally, an accepted compromise, such as his, is synonymous with a settlement. Secondly, in honour and in effect, a compromise, such as his, made at the cost of the fundamentals of a cause, is synonymous with capitulation. If he thinks otherwise, let me remind him of the *Millat's* cause. and of the result of his compromise. What was—and is—the *Millat's* cause? It was—and is—no less than the security and sovereignty of 100 million Muslims in *Dinia*. What has his compromise achieved? In a word, British blight for the fifty million in Pakistan and *Bangistan* and Hindu hell for the fifty million in the rest of *Dinia*. Can he deny that? If not, he must admit that his acceptance is not a compromise but a capitulation—a capitulation that is not only a crime against the *Millat* but also a calamity for it.

It may be claimed by him that, in spite of its grievous implications, his compromise has "won" for the *Millat* what could not be won otherwise. Such a claim will just be an insult to the *Millat*'s intelligence. In accepting the British Plan he merely accepted what had already been rejected by Muslims when a part of it was given by the British in the partition of Bengal in 1905 and when the rest of it was offered in their oft-repeated proposal to create a big Muslim province, comprising the Western Punjab, Afghania, Sindh, and Balochistan. Not only that. By accepting by the Caste Hindu leader, Lala Lajpat Rai, in 1924—and rejected by Muslims.

That is why both the British and the *Banias* are now rejoicing over their success—as well as their might. For by clever tactics, including mock-heroic opposition even to what they had voluntarily offered before, they both inveigled him into the belief that for him to get that much now would be a great victory for the Muslims, a great defeat for the Caste Hindus, and a great concession by the British. To imprint this on his mind, right up to the very last minute, Mr. Churchill, the spokesman of the British Imperialists, continued to express his utter abhorrence of "the destruction of the unity of India"; while Mr. Gandhi—the spokesman of both the Congress and Caste Hinduism—kept declaring "even if the whole of India burns, even if the Muslims demand it at the point of the sword, we will never agree to the vivisection of India" This was play-acting, par excellence. It was part of their brilliant strategy to fob the Muslims off with the shadow of Pakistan and so destroy the substance of Pakistan by manoeuvering Mr. Jinnah into accepting what, in his own words, now conveniently forgotten by him—was "absolutely unacceptable," because it was "a mutilated, truncated, and moth-eaten Pakistan." In this they have succeeded. They have given *Pastan*, and refused Pakistan. This is bad enough. Worse still is the fact that they have disintegrated and enslaved the *Millat* and frustrated the Pak Plan, which alone could place "Indianism" on the pyre and bury British Imperialism; and which alone could protect the failure of the whole *Millat* in *Dinia*.

No wonder then that, after Mr. Jinnah's acceptance of the British Plan, Mr. Churchill, ignoring his past persistent opposition, felicitated the British Government on the success of their plan. Why? Because that plan destroyed the unity of the *Millat* more than the unity of India. And Mr.

Gandhi, changing his opinion overnight and forgetting his "even if the whole of India burns..."declarations, congratulated all parties concerned, including the British Government, and the Viceroy, on the acceptance of the British Plan. Why? Because that Plan ensured the vivisection of the *Millat* more than the vivisection of India.

It may of course be stated by Mr. Jinnah that his act is only a beginning and that later on Muslims will discover what they have lost through it. Such a statement will be a mere sop. For every schoolboy knows, first, that owing to the fundamental change in the Indian situation, what was feasible for us until 1942, ceased to be feasible then and is absolutely impossible today; and, secondly, that, whatever the situation, to begin by crippling one's own people, as he has strengthened the Caste Hindus, is to make sure of ultimate ruin, not of ultimate recovery. History shows that no heritage, so imperiled, as has been ours by him, has ever been recovered. If he doesn't know that he had better study at least the sombre sequel of the Moors' retreat from Portugal and Spain into their North African homelands—a retreat which is to this day mourned by their people and by all other Muslims.

It may be pleaded by him that the disintegration of the *Millat* was unavoidable. That plea will be false; because the disintegration could have been averted by making a firm stand for the implementation of the Pak Plan. Under that Plan all our 100 million Muslims and the whole of our heritage including sacred places and splendid monuments, imperial cities and princely states, would have all been secured and secured in full Islamic freedom.

To make a firm stand for the implementation of the Pak Plan was all the more essential in view of the mass murders of Muslims in Cawnpore in wholesale butchery in Bihar. To make such a stand became all the easier, too, after the Caste Hindu and Sikh demand for the partition of the Punjab and Bengal, because that demand could, on a similar but sounder principle, be effectively countered by a demand for a partition of all the regions of *Dinia* into Hindu and Muslim regions. On the one hand, this would have averted the loss, to Pakistan, of the Eastern Punjab and half of the historical Sindh (Palanpur, Kachch, Kathiawar, and Kambay), of the whole Delhi Division and the cis-Jamuna territories; and, the *Bangistan*, of Western Bengal and Assam. On the other hand, it would have consolidated as nations the Muslims of the Deccan in Osmanistan, of Bihar and Orissa in Faruqistan, of Bundhelkhand and Malwa in Siddiqistan, of Hindustan in Haidaristan, of Rajistan in Muinistan, and of South India in Maplistan. By South India I mean the Madras Presidency, where in its region of Malabar and the Alam Islands Muslims constitute a far greater majority of population than do the Caste Hindus Eastern Punjab; where the devout Mapilas symbolize the invincible "Mujahidism" of Islam; and where, for obvious reasons, a square inch of territory is as important to the *Millat* as a square mile in its inland countries.

It may be argued by him that to implement the Pak Plan would have involved the impossible operation of transferring Muslim populations, numbering no less than fifty million Muslims. This argument will be a mere excuse. For at this very moment a similar transfer involving an equally large number of people is being carried through

in Europe. What is possible in Europe cannot be impossible in *Dinia*.

## How to Redeem the *Millat*?

It is useless to dwell further on Mr. Jinnah's explanations of his acceptance of the British Plan; for such explanations cannot mislead the *Millat*, which knows—and members—that he it was who favoured "Joint Electorates" to create common nationhood of Hindus and Muslims, who demanded and accepted the fatal Indian Federation, who frowned at the birth of the ideal of Pakistan in 1933, who on adopting it in 1940 distorted it; and who accepted the vicious British Plan of the 16th May, 1946. It remembers that he was wrong then, and knows that he is wrong now in accepting the wicked British Plan of the 2nd June, 1947.

It is also useless to dwell further on his explanations because they cannot save the *Millat* from the consequences of his acceptance. This is clear in all its grimness. So, the sooner we grasp that fact, the better for us all; and the quicker we act in its light, the better for the *Millat*. For the time is too short and the tragedy too shattering.

## Inspiration From Our Heroes

This fact leads to the irresistible conclusion that the only thing that can now save the *Millat* is the heroic effort and sustained action of the Muslims themselves—an action which will spring from their selfless devotion to the *Millat*. It can do that because such devotion is the most saving thing in the affairs of nations as of individuals. The vital thing therefore is that, in this crisis, we should all realize

our duty and do it in a spirit of absolute dedication to the *Millat*.

To realize that duty and to do it in that spirit we have only to ask ourselves a simple question:-

HOW WOULD QASIM, MAHMUD, BABUR, AURANGZEB, ABDALI OR TIPPU HAVE ACTED IN SUCH A CRISIS AS CONFRONTS US TODAY?

If we put that question to ourselves, we shall immediately realize our duty; for the very names of those heroes spell duty and devotion to Islam and the *Millat*. They inspire the conviction that in such a crisis not one of them would have retreated a single step, surrendered a single Muslim, or renounced a single inch of the *Millat*'s heritage in *Dinia*; that, on the contrary, each of them would have unhesitatingly staked his all for the *Millat*'s cause. This is natural. For, as we all know, irrespective of the immediate circumstances it was really for the whole *Millat*'s cause that Qasim suffered the tortures of chains and died a most tragic death; that Mahmud launched seventeen campaigns in India and exhausted himself to death; that Babur risked his life in a "do or die" battle with the Rajputs at Sikri; that Aurangzeb spent even his last days subjugating the Mahrattas in the Deccan; that Abdali accepted the challenge of the Mahrattas and in a life and death grapple defeated them at Panipat; and that Tippu preferred death to dishonour and fell fighting the British at Seringapattam.

## Supreme Devotion to Duty

This conviction of what our heroes would have done in such a crisis as the one we face today will enlighten us to our own duty. Not only that. It will inspire supreme devotion to duty. It will steel us to fight for the freedom of the whole *Millat* in *Dinia* and its Dependencies, and sustain us in the fight till man by man all nations of the *Millat* are freed, and mile by mile all its countries are liberated.

Obviously, nothing could be more saving than such an inspiration, and nothing more promising than such a determination. For both are in the noblest tradition of *Mujahidism* and both can overcome the present crisis—a crisis in which the honour and heritage of the *Millat*, its history and hopes are all in danger. They all cry to be saved. Saved they must be if the *Millat* is to survive; and saved they can be, if we all unite, follow the right course and fight for the cause of the *Millat*.

## The Two Courses

What then is the right course for us to follow in order to serve the *Millat* and save its heritage?

In a word, two courses lie open before us all. One is the course of Pak Plan and the other of the British Plan, to both of which I have already referred. It is about these two that we must make up our minds and it is of these two that we must take the right one.

To enable all to choose the right course. I shall briefly describe them both and the ends to which they lead.

First, the course of the Pak Plan. This is the course of honour, heroism, and *Mujahidism*. It is long; it is hard; and it involves struggle, suffering, and sacrifice. But it leads to ultimate triumph. That is to say, it leads among other things to a division, on the basis of population, of all the regions of *Dinia* between the Caste Hindus and the Muslims—and others; to the recognition of our 100 million Muslims as a single *Millat*; then to their integration in ten nations each in its individual homeland, i.e. the Muslims of North-West *Dinia* in Pakistan, of North-East *Dinia* in *Bangistan*, of the Deccan in *Osmanistan*, of Bundhelkhand and Malwa in *Siddiqistan*, of Bihar and Orissa in *Faruqistan*, of Hindustan (U.P.) in *Haidaristan*, of Rajistan in *Muinistan*, of South India in *Maplistan*, of Western Ceylon in *Safistan*, and of Eastern Ceylon in *Nasaristan*; and finally to the co-ordination of all these nations in the Pak Commonwealth of Nations.

It is worth recording that this course is not only a true but also a tested one. For it is essentially the same course as that taken by Mahmud at Somnath in 1024, and by Babur at Sikri in 1527, and more recently by the French at Verdun in 1916; by the British in London in 1949; and by the Russians at Stalingrad in 1942. Thus it is a course by taking which we can save thirteen centuries of the *Millat's* history, secure the freedom of our 100 million Muslims, recover the *Millat's* spiritual and territorial heritage, and ensure the fulfillment of its Mission in *Dinia*.

## The British Plan

The other course is the course of the British Plan, which has already been taken by Mr. Jinnah and his All-India Muslim League. This is the course of convenience, capitulation, and quislingism. It is short; it is easy; it promises pervasive flunkeyism, high posts, and lucrative privileges. But it leads to ultimate tragedy. That is to say, it leads among other things to the disintegration of the whole *Millat*, to the loss of its vast and valuable territories, to the enslavement by the Caste Hindus of its fifty million Muslims living in the Hindu-majority regions of *Dinia*; and to the *quislingization* by the British of its fifty million Muslims living in Pakistan and *Bangistan*.

It is worth remembering that this course is not only false in principle, but also condemned by experience. For it is essentially the same course as that taken by Mir Jaafar in *Bangistan* in 1757, by most of the *Jalalatmaabs* in India in 1857 and by those Moorish leaders in Iberia who in 1212 rather than marshal all their *Milli* manpower and fight a decisive battle with their enemies divided the *Millat* and suffered defeat, which made inevitable their retreat from Spain into their North African homeland; and more recently by Joseph Tito in Slovakia in 1939 and by Marshal Petain in France in 1940. Thus it is a course by taking which we shall obliterate thirteen centuries of the *Millat's* history, lose the freedom of our 100 million Muslims, forfeit the *Millat*'s spiritual and territorial heritage, and ensure the frustration of its Mission in *Dinia*.

## The *Millat* at the Crossroads

At this fateful moment in the history of the *Millat* when it stands at the crossroads of its destiny, such are the two courses which lie open before us all, and such are the antipodal ends to which they lead. In view of that, it must be clear to all of us that our choice of the course will decide whether the whole *Millat* shall live in honour and freedom, or perish in dishonour and slavery. If we make our choice in the realization of the supreme fact I am certain not one of us, possessing pride of name and principles of life, professing respect and reverence for the *Millat's* cause, can take the course of the British Plan. For anyone to do that is to be guilty of both suicide and homicide. Suicide of the individual self and homicide the *Millat*.

## The Movement for the Pak Plan

I am proud to declare that, inspired by this realization, the Pakistan, National Movement is, as before, determined to follow the course of the Pak Plan, and to continue its fight for the liberation of the whole *Millat* in the Continent of *Dinia* and its Dependencies.

To give formal expression to its determination, I declare before the *Millat*, the Fraternity, and the world, that the Pakistan National Movement rejects the British Plan and repudiates its acceptance on the *Millat's* behalf by Mr. Jinnah and his All-India Mulsim League; that it reiterates its demand for the implementation of the Pak Plan, which alone can, as already shown, integrate our 100 million Muslims in ten nations in the ten countries of *Pakistan, Bangistan, Osmanistan, Siddiqistan, Faruqistan,*

*Haidaristan*, *Muinistan*, *Maplistan*, *Safiistan*, and *Nasaristan*; which alone can keep, in Pakistan, at least the Eastern Punjab, the Delhi Division, the cis-Jamuna territories; and, in *Bangistan*, Western Bengal and Assam; and which alone can ensure, among other things, the fulfillment of the *Millat's* Mission in the Continent of *Dinia* and its Dependencies. Furthermore, I declare that the Movement will, come what may, carry on its struggle till it has achieved the implementation of the Pak Plan. Finally, I warn the British, the Caste Hindus, the Achuts, the Dravidians, the Sikhs, and all other nations and princely states in *Dinia* that any treaties, pacts or agreements they may conclude with Mr. Jinnah and his All-India Muslim League on the basis of the British Plan will not bind the Movement, the Pak Nation in Pakistan, and the Pak *Millat* in the rest of *Dinia* and its Dependencies.

**My Call to the Muslims**

This is the course which the Pakistan National Movement has taken; and which it will tread to the end in order to secure the liberation of the whole *Millat*. In the solemn belief that this is the only road leading to the destiny of the *Millat*, I call all Muslims to it. I urge them to follow the Pak Plan, to reject the British Plan and repudiate its acceptance in the *Millat's* name by Mr. Jinnah and his All-India Muslim League. I appeal to them to co-operate with the Pakistan National Movement to ensure and hasten the liberation of the whole *Millat* in *Dinia*. I fervently hope and pray they will not fail the *Millat* in this crisis of its Destiny.

In conclusion, I address a comradely word to all members of the Pakistan National Movement and of its allied organization—the National Movement of *Bangistan, Osmanistan, Siddiqistan, Faruqistan, Haidaristan, Muinistan, Maplistan, Safiistan,* and *Nasaristan,* and the *All-Dinia Milli* Movement. That word is this: In this crisis all parties and organizations are on their trial. So are ours. Mr. Jinnah and His League have already forgotten their solemn commitments, accepted the British Plan, and betrayed the *Millat*. It may be that, owing to the relentless pressure of the *British-Bania Alliance* and of the Leaguers, most of the other parties will follow them. If they do, so much the worse for them; but that must not and shall not mean the end of the struggle for the freedom and the future of the *Millat*. For we must and we will carry on the fight to the end, if possible with the co-operation of others, if necessary, alone. We will never quit or capitulate.

We will never forget the tears and blood shed, and the shame and humiliation suffered, by our *Millat* since 1857; we will never forsake our promises and declarations to serve the whole *Millat* and struggle for the honour and independence of all our 100 million Muslims. It shall never be said of us that, when the time came to chose between the greatest battle for the *Millat* and the greatest betrayal of the *Millat*, we too followed the quislings and chose betrayal; that we too acquiesced in their treacherous sake if fifty million to the British; and that we too joined them in their cowardly retreat to the position from which the ancestors of us all emerged in 711 to conquer India for Islam and to convert it into *Dinia*.

We will ever remember the shame and sufferings of our *Millat*, and stand by our promises and declarations; we will stake our all to carry them out and sacrifice our all to liberate the *Millat*; and we will, Insha Allah! add a new chapter of glory to the history of Islam in the Continent of *Dinia* and its Dependencies.

Long Live The *Millat*!
Long Live Its Ten Nations!
Long Live Its Ten Countries!

---

* *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali*, Edited by K.K. Aziz, Vol.1, Islamabad, pp.291-301

# 7

## A Bitter Story*

By

Khalid Hasan

Every now and then someone calls for bringing back the remains of the man who invented the name Pakistan back in 1933 while a student at Cambridge. Calls go out for honouring the true hero of the Pakistan movement and to bury him at least next to the Quaid-i-Azam.

A Chaudhari Rahmat Ali day is also observed here and there. For some years at least, a ceremonial wreath was placed on his grave by a group in England who believed that the state their hero had conceived had denied him his due place. These sentiments are expressed out of a sense of patriotism and love for Pakistan and one should take them in that light. However, were any of the devotees of Chaudhari Rahmat Ali only to be aware of what he wrote about the establishment of Pakistan and Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah, they would change their opinion.

Born in 1897, Rahmat Ali went to Lahore's Islamia College and from there to Cambridge when in 1931 he co-authored a pamphlet called *Now or Never* with three other students, one of whom was Aslam Khattak who claims to

this day that it was he and not Rahmat Ali who came up with the name Pakistan.

Rahmat Ali was highly critical of Iqbal for having proposed an Indian federation as he argued that this would reduce the Muslims to a minority in a united India and, further, that the administrative provinces proposed by Iqbal would lack autonomy. Rahmat Ali was not one for moderate language, always choosing the most lethal epithets to denounce those, he thought were betraying the *Millat* or had already done so. He considered them to be "quislings" of the *British-Bania Alliance*. He castigated every Muslim leader who did not share his confused, emotional vision of a Muslim kingdom reigning over India and adjacent regions as a camp follower of British imperialism and an agent of caste-Hindu nationalism.

Rahmat Ali saw any Muslim politician who advocated an Indian federation as having succumbed to "careerism". He also denounced the Round Table Conferences as having been inspired by the *British-Bania Alliance*. Any Muslim who tried to extract concessions for the community from Whitehall as a traitor. That included practically the entire recognized Muslim leadership, including Iqbal and the Quaid.

He declared grandly that they had all failed and "Allah had assigned that fateful task to me, that He commanded me to do it, that he wanted me to challenge the mighty, to oppose the Indian federation, to propose the Islamic federation. Once the feeling came, it possessed me; it governed my life; it directed my activities. Inspired by that divine mission, I came to the conclusion that it was now or never."

Rahmat Ali's concept of Pakistan was nebulous, fantasy-ridden, impractical and unattainable. His ideal Muslim homeland consisted of the entire North-western India, the Kathiawar peninsula and Kutch, several enclaves deep inside the modern-day Uttar Pradesh, including the Palanpur Agency and the cities of Delhi and Lucknow. He called for the establishment of three independent Muslim states in India: *Bangistan*, made up of undivided Bengal and Assam, Andhra Pradesh, and Pakistan in the northwest. His scheme also included as part of this Muslim kingdom 243 smaller princely states and principalities that he wanted to be Pakistan's tributaries, as if Pakistan was going to be an imperial power exercising absolute authority over the entire Indian subcontinent.

As for the Hindu majority, Rahmat Ali divided it into two categories: caste Hindus and others, but both to be herded together and pushed into a ghetto he called *Hanoodia*. The Sikhs were to be placed in a concentration camp called *Sikhia*. As for other religions and races, they were all to live in a territory called *Hanadika*. All these religions and races were to remain subservient to the master race he called **The Paks**. However, if any Muslims were to be found living in the three non-Muslim enclaves, they were to be gifted six regions across the mainland. For some reason, Rahmat Ali did not want them to come to the three Muslim states already in existence. Nowhere did he explain how precisely he was going to carve up India and turn its non-Muslim majority into slaves and chattels. India, he renamed *Dinia*. Rahmat Ali had quite an imagination when it came to names.

Rahmat Ali's abusive denunciation of the Quaid-i-Azam came exactly six days after the Muslim League's acceptance of the June 3 Plan. In a statement—later a pamphlet called *The Great Betrayal* —he castigated the Quaid and the League as "having written the most shameful and the most treacherous page in the annals of the *Millat*". He called for the rejection of the Plan in favour of his **Pak Plan**. He attacked the Quaid for being responsible for the "greatest betrayal of the *Millat* in all her history", charging that the "blackest treachery" had been committed by Jinnah who had re-enacted the fall of Muslim Spain in India.

Rahmat Ali wrote, "To his crying shame, the consuming agony of the *Millat* and to the contemptuous joy of the *British-Bania Alliance*", Jinnah has accepted a Plan that "spells peril to Islam", having "acted the Judas and betrayed, bartered and dismembered the *Millat* animated by ambition for recognition as the Quisling-i-Azam of Pakistan and *Bangistan*". He called him "far worse a traitor than Mir Ja'far in 1757 and the Muslim aristocracy in 1857". He accused the founder of Pakistan of having "shattered the foundations of Muslim nationhood and sabotaged the future of 100 million Muslims living in the continent of *Dinia* and its dependencies". He called on all Muslims to rise against Jinnah and "repudiate and nullify his treacherous plan".

Rahmat Ali said Jinnah had dealt six deadly blows to the *Millat* that included the division of Bengal and Assam, and abandonment of Muslim forts and citadels, including the cities of Delhi, Agra and Lucknow. He said the Quaid had turned past Muslim victories into defeats and "perverted the verdict of history" and was now making

"desperate attempts to white-wash the betrayal". He was asking Muslims to celebrate "Marg-i-*Millat* as Jashn-i-Jinnah, adding the "smear of shame to the sorrow of disaster". Jinnah had not accepted Pakistan but *Pastan*, the shadow of Pakistan, having done Hindu and British bidding being a "loyal, glorified servant of the King of Britain" who was "witless, powerless, weaponless".

Rahmat Ali came to Pakistan and as the late Dr. Ashiq Hussain Batalvi used to tell me in London, he used to rant and rave against the Quaid all day and inflict the vilest abuse on him. Finally, this bitter and lonely man returned to England, a country that he expressed such contempt for. He died in Cambridge in 1951 where he now lies buried, finally at peace.

---

* "Private View", *Dawn*, (Karachi), March 26, 2001.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## a) Books


1. Allama Muhammad Iqbal, *Kulliyat-i-Iqbal* (Urdu) Lahore, 1973
2. Ibid., (Farsi), Lahore, 1989.
3. Ibid., *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, Lahore, 1992.
4. Ibid., *Stray Reflections*, Lahore, 1989. Edited by Javed Iqbal.
5. Ibid., *Speeches and Statesments of Iqbal*, Lahore, 1973.
6. Ibid., *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal*, 1977.
7. M.A. Jinnah, *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*, Lahore, 1941.
8. Rahmat Ali, *Pakistan: The Fatherland of the Pak Nation*, Lahore, First Pakistani Edition, 1978.
9. Ibid, *Complete Works of Rahmat Ali*, edited by K.K. Aziz. Islamabad, 1978.
10. K.K. Aziz, *Rahmat Ali: A Biography*, Lahore, 1987.
11. Mohammad Sharif Baqa, *Chaudhry Rahmat Ali-Aik Mukhtasar Taaruf* (Urdu), Lahore, 1981.
12. Ibid., *Chaudhry Rahmat Ali Ne Kaha*, (Urdu) Lahore, 1984.
13. Abdul Hamid, *Chaudhry Rehmat Ali aur Tehrik-e-Pakistan* (Urdu), Lahore, 1995.
14. Chaudhry Muhammad Ashraf, *Mussawar-e-Pakistan Kaun? Talkh Haqaiq*, (Urdu), Islamabad, 1997.

15. Nisar Ahmed Kasana, *Mutaliba-e-Pakistan aur Chaudhry Rahmat Ali*, (Urdu), Faisalabad, 1977.
16. B.A. Dar, *Letters and Writings of Iqbal*, Karachi, 1967.
17. Ahmed Saeed, *Iqbal aur Quaid-e-Azam* (Urdu), Lahore 1977.
18. Ahmed Saeed, *Writings of Quaid-e-Azam*. Lahore, 1976.
19. Khalid Bin Sayeed, *Pakistan : The Formative Phase*, Lahore, 1967.
20. Waheed Uzzaman, *Towards Pakistan*, Lahore 1978.
21. Ishtiaq Hussain Qureshi, *The Struggle for Pakistan*, Karachi, (4th edition), 1979.
22. Aziz Ahmed, *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan*, London, 1967.
23. Freeland Abbot, *Islam and Pakistan*, New York 1968.
24. Chaudhry Mohammad Ali, *The Emergence of Pakistan*, New York 1967.
25. G. Schuster and Guy Wint, *India and Democracy*, London, 1941.
26. Jahanara Shahnawaz, *Father and Daughter : A Political Autobiography*, Lahore, 1971.
27. Muhammad Munir, *Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah*, Lahore, 1976.
28. Abdus Salam Khurshid, *History of the Idea of Pakistan*, Lahore 1987.
29. K.K. Aziz, *A History of the Idea of Pakistan*, Lahore, 1987.
30. Saad, R. Khairi, *Jinnah Reinterpreted*, Karachi 1995.
31. S.M. Ikram, *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan*, Lahore, 1959.
32. J.D. Matthews, *Iqbal*, London, 1996.

33. Kirpal Sindh, *The Origin of Pakistan*, New Delhi.
34. M,A. Khan, *Iqbal Ka Siyasi Karnama* (Urdu), Karachi, 1952.
35. Shafique Ali Khan, *Two Nation Theory*, Hyderabad, Sind, 1973.

**b) Magazines and Newspapers**

1. *Bombay Chronicle*
2. *Leader*, Allahhabad
3. *Indian Daily Mail*, Bombay
4. *Nawa-i-Waqt*, Lahore
5. *Morning News*, Calcutta (now Kolkata)
6. *The Pakistan Times*, Lahore
7. *The Spokesman*, New Delhi (weekly)
8. *Gujjar Gazette*, (weekly), Lahore

# INDEX

## G



## H



## I



## J



## K



## L

## M



## N



## P



## Q



## R

# OTHER BOOKS

| | |
|---|---|
| The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam | Allama Muhammad Iqbal |
| Iqbal: The Great Poet of Islam | Sh. Abdul Qadir |
| Iqbal: New Dimensions | Ed. by M. Ikram Chaghatai |
| Iqbal: The Spiritual Father of Pakistan | Rashida Malik |

| | |
|---|---|
| اقبال فراموشی | پروفیسر فتح محمد ملک |
| اقبال کا فکری نظام اور تصورِ پاکستان | پروفیسر فتح محمد ملک |
| اقبال از اقبال | پروفیسر فتح محمد ملک |
| اپنا گریباں چاک (خودنوشت سوانح حیات) | ڈاکٹر جاوید اقبال |
| مفکرِ پاکستان | محمد حنیف شاہد |
| کلیاتِ اقبال | علامہ محمد اقبال |
| بانگِ درا (اعلیٰ ایڈیشن) | علامہ محمد اقبال |
| شکوہ جوابِ شکوہ | علامہ محمد اقبال |
| اقبال شناسی اور آغا صادق | ترتیب: ڈاکٹر نوید حسن |
| علامہ اقبال کی سیاسی زندگی | محمد سلیم |
| اقبال ___ نئی تفہیم | ڈاکٹر صدیق جاوید |
| اقبال: شخصیت، افکار و تصورات: مطالعہ کا نیا تناظر | ڈاکٹر سلیم اختر |
| علامہ اقبال - حیات، فکر، فن | ڈاکٹر سلیم اختر |
| اقبال اور ہمارے فکری رویے | ڈاکٹر سلیم اختر |
| فکرِ اقبال کا تعارف | ڈاکٹر سلیم اختر |
| فکرِ اسلامی کی تشکیلِ نو | پروفیسر محمد عثمان |
| اقبال کے آخری دو سال | عاشق حسین بٹالوی |
| ولی سے اقبال تک | ڈاکٹر سید عبداللہ |

www.sang-e-meel.com
ISBN 969-
9799693